



2012

Romans 1:18-2:11 and the Substructure of Psalm 106(105): Evocations of the Calf?

Alexander James Lucas

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Lucas, Alexander James, "Romans 1:18-2:11 and the Substructure of Psalm 106(105): Evocations of the Calf?" (2012). *Dissertations*. Paper 419.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/419

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 2012 Alexander James Lucas

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

ROMANS 1:18–2:11 AND THE SUBSTRUCTURE OF PSALM 106(105):

EVOCATIONS OF THE CALF?

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN THEOLOGY

BY

ALEXANDER JAMES LUCAS

CHICAGO, IL

AUGUST 2012

Copyright by Alexander James Lucas, 2012
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Although often a solitary endeavor, writing a dissertation is impossible without the support of others. I am very pleased now to acknowledge the academic institutions, friends, and family members who made this dissertation possible. My thanks to the Theology Department of Loyola University Chicago for admitting me to the program and providing financial support, including a research assistantship and advanced doctoral fellowship. The Arthur J. Schmitt foundation was kind enough to award me a doctoral dissertation fellowship for the 2009–2010 academic year. For the 2010–2011 academic year, I had the privilege of working with Professor Peter Lampe at Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, thanks to a U.S. Student Fulbright Grant. The Fulbright grant included a six-week German language course at Philipps-Universität Marburg. The time in Germany was wonderful both professionally and personally. I would like thank Professor Michael Welker and his wife, Nora Kestermann, Sebastian Henze and Daniela Velt, the Schaefer family, Peter Münch and Julia Klein, Dr. Christian Jungblut and Friederike Schücking, and Hans Arneson for making the time in Germany so enjoyable.

My dissertation committee, Drs. Robert A. Di Vito, Edmondo F. Lupieri, and director Thomas H. Tobin, SJ, were especially patient with me in the early phases of the project and then were generous with their time as I turned in one chapter after another in relatively short succession. At an important point in the writing process, one in which I was attempting to redefine the project and thereby reduce its scope, Dr. Tobin was kind

enough to approve the redefinition but also, as a good director, encouraged me to give more thought to what I was trying to do before proceeding further. That wise counsel proved crucial in enabling me to complete the project. Dr. Lupieri was instrumental in helping lay the foundation for the Fulbright grant I received and also was especially attentive as a second-reader of my dissertation, consistently encouraging me, for example, to think about how the themes I discussed related to the Patristic period of Christianity. And Dr. Di Vito brought his considerable expertise in the Hebrew Bible to bear on my attempts to analyze the psalms and Pentateuch. I am grateful for the ways in which each of them has shaped me as a scholar. I would also like to single out Dr. Pauline Viviano, for her role as a teaching mentor, and Catherine Wolf and Marianne Wolfe, for their help in all things administrative.

Throughout my studies, I have been blessed with tremendous family support. I would like to thank Steve and Sandy Ehrhardt for their continual encouragement. Indeed, rare is the father-in-law who attends the paper presentations and reads the academic publications of his son-in-law. My own parents, Luke and Kathie Lucas, instilled in me the intellectual ideals and skills that gave me the confidence to undertake a project of this magnitude. My mother deserves special mention as she patiently copy-edited the entire dissertation, sometimes catching, with her eagle eye, mistakes in languages she has never studied. Finally, my wife Keri has been the perfect combination of cheerleader, coach, and companion. As I write this acknowledgement, we are days away from celebrating our 11th wedding anniversary. A lot of life has happened in those eleven years. The one constant, however, has been my status as a student. I am eager for that constant to come to end and to begin anew with you.

For Keri

... καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν
ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων,
ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα....

—2 Peter 3:15b–16a

PREFACE

This dissertation has its origin in a paper written for a course on the Apostle Paul taught by Dr. Thomas H. Tobin, SJ, in the Fall of 2005. Work on the dissertation itself, however, did not begin until the Spring of 2008. One of the challenges of writing a dissertation is acquainting oneself with secondary literature and also keeping up with that literature as one's own project takes shape. This challenge is especially acute for Pauline scholars. In terms of secondary literature relevant to my project, the following two works deserve special mention: Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Jonathan A. Linebaugh, "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11," *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–37. Although both receive attention, they undoubtedly would have featured more prominently had this dissertation been written at a later date or had the works appeared earlier.

Another challenge of writing a dissertation is that one's own ideas inevitably develop, sometimes to the point that one must modify the project as a whole. The present project underwent such a modification in 2011. Prior to this modification, the governing metaphor for the dissertation was a picture puzzle. The four interlocking pavement stones, for example, were instead four puzzle pieces. This manner of conceptualizing the dissertation is reflected in the following two publications: Alec J. Lucas, "Unearthing an Intra-Jewish Interpretive Debate? Romans 1:18–2:4; Wisdom of Solomon 11–19; and

Psalms 105(104)–107(106),” *Annali di Storia dell’Esegesi* 27 (2010): 69–91); idem, “Distinct Portraits and Parallel Development of the Knowledge of God in Romans 1:18–32 and Wisdom of Solomon 13–15,” *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 61–82[61, n. 1]. In the former, I employ the puzzle-metaphor in my analysis of Rom 1:18–2:4; in the latter, I refer to the dissertation under its old title, “The Puzzle of Paul’s Argument in Romans 1:18–2:11.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
ABSTRACT	xxi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Project	1
Constructing Towers and Texts	1
Romans 1:18–32 and 2:1–11: Ethnic Inhabitants on Either Side of Bridge	2
Introducing the Four Pavement Stones	6
Interpreting the Four Pavement Stones	7
Interlocking Stones	7
Textual Context	10
Cultural and Historical Context	12
Proposal	13
Aligning the Pavement Stones	13
Analyzing the Textual Substructure	14
Importance of Romans 1:23	14
Substructure of Psalm 106(105)	16
Reading the Textual Surface	18
Romans 1:18–32: Ironical Application of Psalm 106(105)	19
Romans 2:1–4: Inferential Application of Psalm 106(105)	22
Romans 2:5–11: Indirect Application of Psalm 106(105)	24
Sketching a Larger Context	30
General Confusion: Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire	31
Particular Conversation: Differing Understandings of Jewish Identity in Wisdom of Solomon 11–19 and Psalms 105(104)–107(106)	32
Pauline Exploitation: Re-Reading Romans 1:18–2:11	36
Plan: Preview of Chapters	36
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	40
Introduction	40
Four Pavement Stones	41
Problematic Particle: Διό	41
Excising Διό	43
Eliminating Inferential Sense of Διό	45
Embracing Inferential Sense of Διό	48
Connecting Διό to τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα	50

Uncertain Similarity: τὰ αὐτὰ and τὰ τοιαῦτα	52
Unidentified Interlocutor: Gentile, Generic Judge, or Jew	56
Gentile	59
Generic Judge	61
Jew	65
Possible Dialogue Partner: Romans 1:18–2:11 and Wisdom of Solomon 11–19	74
Predominate Paradigm: Dependence, Independence, and Comparative	
Analysis	76
Literary Dependence	76
Eduard Grafe (1892)	76
William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam (1895)	83
Eduard Norden (1906, 1913)	87
Literary Independence	89
Emil Weber (1905)	89
Friedrich Focke (1913)	92
Otto Michel (1929)	96
Comparative Analysis	98
Paul-Gerhard Keyser (1971)	98
Beverly R. Gaventa (1987)	101
Joseph R. Dodson (2008)	102
Problematizing the Paradigm: Inadequacy of Dependence or	
Independence	103
Alternate Paradigm: Substantive Endorsement or Subversive Engagement	105
Substructure of Psalm 106(105)	108
Anticipatory Analyses	108
Pre-Critical	108
Textual Tradition	108
Patristic Period	109
Critical	109
Leslie C. Allen (1964) and Morna D. Hooker (1966)	109
Jouette M. Bassler (1982)	111
Francis Watson (2004)	112
Errant Analyses	115
John R. Levison (2004)	115
Beverly R. Gaventa (2005)	117
Douglas A. Campbell (2009)	119
Conclusion	123
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGICAL MATTERS	124
Introduction	124
Hermeneutical Approach	124
Building upon Metaleptic Allusion and Complex Conversation	125
Metaleptic Allusion in the Work of Richard B. Hays	126
Complex Conversation in the Work of Francis Watson	135
Employing Metaleptic Allusion and Complex Conversation	138

Importance of the Original Audience and Other Ancient Realities	141
Christopher D. Stanley's Objections	143
Introduction: Paul's, Hays's, or Stanley's Misjudgment	143
Inaccessibility	148
Literacy	151
Absence of Synagogue Influence and Presence of Guessing in Romans	155
Critical Response	156
Accessibility	157
Fluency	162
Presence of Synagogue Influence and Absence of Guessing in Romans	170
Appreciative Appropriation: Orality and Excerpts	174
Literary and Linguistic Atmosphere	178
Literary Atmosphere: Textual Fluidity in the Post-Qumran Era	178
Linguistic Atmosphere	180
Paul's Greek Text	180
Critical Editions of the Septuagint: Psalms as a Test Case	183
Conclusion	192
CHAPTER 4: PSALM 106(105)	194
Introduction	194
Psalm 106(105): Israelite Infidelity Outside and Inside the Land	195
Praise, Penitence, and Concluding Plea (vv. 1–6, 47)	197
Rebellion Outside the Land: Seven Sins (vv. 7–33)	199
Overview of Sins One to Three and Five to Seven (vv. 7–18, 24–33)	201
Embitterment at Red Sea and LORD's Salvation (vv. 7–12)	201
Impatient Craving in the Desert (vv. 13–15)	204
Angering Moses and Aaron in the Camp (vv. 16–18)	207
Heedless Grumbling in the Tents of Kadesh Barnea (vv. 24–27)	212
Initiation into Baal of Peor and Phinehas' Propitiation (vv. 28–31)	215
Inciting Moses at the Water of Strife (vv. 32–33)	219
Analysis of Fourth Sin: Calf Worship at Horeb and Moses' Intercession (vv. 19–23)	220
Centrality of Calf Worship: Positional, Terminological, Intertextual, and Thematic	220
Exegesis, Comparison, Conflation: Exodus 32–34, Deuteronomy 9–10, Psalm 106(105):19–20, 23a,d	226
Exegesis of Exodus 32–34	226
Exegesis of Deuteronomy 9–10	245
Comparison of Moses' Intercession in Exodus 32–34 and Deuteronomy 9–10	265
Conflation in Psalm 106(105):19–20, 23a,d	268
Rebellion Inside the Land: Cyclical Sin (vv. 34–46)	272
Anticipating Paul's Appropriation of Psalm 106(105)	275

Conclusion	278
CHAPTER 5: ROMANS 1:18–2:11	280
Introduction	280
Structural Analysis	282
Romans 1:18–32: Reorienting the Paradigm around an <i>A–BA–BA–B</i> Pattern	283
Dialectical History of Scholarship	285
Thesis: E. Klostermann et al.	285
Initial Articulation and Early Endorsement: E. Klostermann (1933) and S. Schulz (1958)	285
Secondary Developments: J. Jeremias (1954) and W. Popkes (1982)	287
Tertiary Developments: J. M. Bassler (1982)	290
Antithesis: S. Lyonnet (1957)	292
Synthesis: G. Bouwman (1973)	295
Concluding Reflections on the History of Scholarship	297
Reorienting the Structural Paradigm	299
Romans 1:18–2:11: Introduction to the Indictment	299
Romans 1:22–32: <i>A–BA–BA–B</i> Structure for the Indictment Proper	301
Romans 2:1–4: Inferential Incorporation of an Unidentified Interlocutor	304
Romans 2:5–11: Elaborate Chiasm on Divine Judgment for Jew First	306
Early Approximations: J. Weiss (1897) and J. Jeremias (1958)	307
Extension and Intrusion: K. Grobel (1964)	310
Apprehending the Double-Chiasm: P. J. Achtemeier (1990)	314
Substructural Analysis	317
Calf and Creation in Romans 1:23: Psalm 106(105):20 and Genesis 1:20–27	319
Adamic Fall	323
Shared Language and Sequence: M. Hooker (1960)	325
Exchange of Nature: J. R. Levison (2004)	326
Idolatrous Inversion	329
Absence of Shared Language and Sequence	329
Exchange of Objects of Worship	332
Retribution in Romans 1:24, 26a, 28: Psalm 106(105):41a	335
Conflation and Chiasm in Romans 2:5–11: Psalm 106(105):23a,d and Deuteronomy 9:27; 10:16, 17	337
Opening Frame of Romans 2:5a: Deuteronomy 9:27b; 10:16 and Philo, <i>De specialibus legibus</i> 1.304–305	339
Closing Frame of Romans 2:11: Divine Impartiality and Deuteronomy 10:17	342
Judgment according to Works in Romans 2:6–11 and Sirach 16:9–14	344
Multiple Affinities	348
Surface Analysis	350
Romans 1:18–32: Ironic Application of Psalm 106(105)	350
Romans 1:18–21: Revelation of and Basis for God’s Wrath	350
Romans 1:22–32: Precipitating Cause for and Results of God’s Wrath	352

Romans 2:1–4: Inferential Application of Psalm 106(105)	354
Romans 2:5–11: Indirect Application of Psalm 106(105)	356
Conclusion	359
 CHAPTER 6: SKETCHING A LARGER CONTEXT	 362
Introduction	362
General Confusion: Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire	364
Contributing Factors	365
Shared Customs	365
Circumcision	365
Abstention from Pork	366
Ethnographic Origin	367
Golden Ass Libel	371
Cultic Conflation and Calf Exclusion/Inclusion	373
Implicit and Explicit Cultic Conflation	375
Implicit Cultic Conflation in <i>Letter of Aristeas</i> 128–71	375
Explicit Cultic Conflation in Plutarch, <i>Quaestionum convivialum libri IX</i> 4.5	376
Calf Exclusion/Inclusion	380
Calf Exclusion in Josephus	380
Calf Inclusion in Philo	383
Particular Conversation: Differing Understandings of Jewish Identity in	
Wisdom of Solomon 11–19 and Psalms 105(104)–107(106)	388
Wisdom of Solomon 11–19	390
Overview of Wisdom of Solomon 11–19: Structure and Hermeneutics	390
Analysis of Wisdom of Solomon 13–15: Aberrant Worship and Calf Interpretation	393
Psalm 105(104) as the Substructure of Wisdom of Solomon 11–19	398
Overview of Psalm 105(104): Structure and Hermeneutics	399
Introductory Call to Praise (vv. 1–6)	399
Land Inheritance: Promise and Fulfillment (vv. 7–11, 42–45)	402
Protection Inside the Land (vv. 12–15, 16–22)	403
Representative Experiences (vv. 12–15)	403
Preparatory Experiences (vv. 16–22)	405
Protection Outside the Land (vv. 23–41)	406
Punishment of Egypt: Seven Plagues (vv. 23–38)	406
Provision for Israel in the Wilderness (vv. 39–41)	410
Psalm 105(104):23–41 and Wisdom of Solomon 11–19: Reconstructing the Contrasts	412
Psalms 105(104)–107(106): Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration	414
Sin, Exile, and Repentance in Psalms 105(104)–106(105)	418
Restoration in Psalm 107(106)	422
Psalm 106(105) as the Antithesis of Wisdom of Solomon 11–19	429
Intra-Jewish Debate?	431
Pauline Exploitation: Re-Reading Romans 1:18–2:11	433

Conclusion	437
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION	439
Summary	439
Primary Proposal	439
Secondary Sketch	446
Avenues for Future Research	450
Postscript: Towers and Texts	453
BIBLIOGRAPHY	455
VITA	488

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Rom 1:23	15
Table 2. Rom 2:3, 5 and <i>Pss. Sol.</i> 15.8; Tob 4:8–10 Parallels	66
Table 3. Wis 11:23; 15:1–4 and Rom 2:2–4 Parallels	71
Table 4. Rom 1:24, 26a, 28	117
Table 5. Ps 143(142):2 and Rom 3:20	128
Table 6. Verbal and Syntactical Repetition in Ps 143(142):2 and Rom 3:20	132
Table 7. <i>1 Clement</i> and Wisdom of Solomon Parallels	172
Table 8. Luke 1:68–79 and Pss 105(104)–107(106) Parallels	177
Table 9. Isa 65:1 and Rom 10:20 Parallels	181
Table 10. Double- <i>Inclusio</i> of Ps 106(105)	200
Table 11. Exod 14:12	202
Table 12. Num 11:33–34	205
Table 13. Deut 1:27	213
Table 14. Ezek 20:23 and Ps 106(105):26–27	214
Table 15. Num 25:1–3	215
Table 16. Ps 106(105):19, 36a, 38c	220
Table 17. Ps 106(105):7–10, 21–22	221
Table 18. Num 16:46–50	222
Table 19. Partial Transfer of Aaronic Intercession in Ps 106(105):23	223

Table 20. More Complete Transfer of Aaronic Intercession in Ps 106(105):30	224
Table 21. Exod 32:1b	229
Table 22. Command and Compliance in Exod 32:2b–3	230
Table 23. Command and Compliance in Exod 33:5c–6	235
Table 24. Mosaic Intercession in Exod 33:16a–c	239
Table 25. Instruction and Fulfillment in Exod 34:1a–b, 2a, 4	240
Table 26. Exod 34:10c–d	243
Table 27. Reversal of the LORD’s Decision in Exod 33:2; 34:11b	243
Table 28. Deut 9:4	248
Table 29. Deut 9:9c, 18a–b, 25a; 10:10a	254
Table 30. Deut 9:18c–19b	256
Table 31. Parallels to Moses’ Intercession in Deut 9:26b–29	257
Table 32. Parallels of Exod 33:16c; 34:10c–d in Deut 10:15, 21	261
Table 33. Parallel of Exod 32:13c in Deut 10:22b	262
Table 34. Deut 10:18b–19	264
Table 35. Ps 106(105):19–20	269
Table 36. Ps 106(105):23	271
Table 37. Comparison of Views on Rom 1:22–32	293
Table 38. Greek Text of the <i>A–BA–BA–B</i> Structure of Rom 1:22–32	301
Table 39. English Translation of the <i>A–BA–BA–B</i> Structure of Rom 1:22–32	302
Table 40. Greek Text of Rom 1:28, 32 and 2:1–3	304
Table 41. English Translation of Rom 1:28, 32 and 2:1–3	305
Table 42. Jer 2:11; Ps 106(105):20; and Rom 1:23	319

Table 43. Gen 1:20–27 and Deut 4:15–18	320
Table 44. <i>GLAE</i> 10.3–11.2	328
Table 45. Deut 9:27b; 10:16 and Rom 2:5a	339
Table 46. Deut 10:17 and Rom 2:11	343
Table 47. Theriolatrous Israelites in <i>Mos.</i> 2.161–62, 169, 270	384
Table 48. Six Other References to the Golden Calf as Egyptian Theriolatry in Philo	385
Table 49. Ps 105(104):7–11, 42–45	403
Table 50. Plagues of Exod 7:14–12:30 and Ps 105(104):28–36	408
Table 51. Ps 105(104):31, 34	409
Table 52. Ps 105(104):39 and Wis 10:17c	413
Table 53. Shared Opening in Pss 105(104)–107(106)	415
Table 54. Ps 105(104):45 and Ps 106(105):3	418
Table 55. Ps 106(105):47a–b and Ps 107(106):2–3	422
Table 56. Double-Refrain of Ps 107(106)	423
Table 57. Pss 106(105):43–45 and 107(106):6, 8, 11, 17	427
Table 58. Pss 106(105):7, 9 and 107(106):23–24, 26, 30	428

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of primary sources are those of *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (ed. Patrick H. Alexander et al.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

Secondary Sources

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972–
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
AthR	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CC	Continental Commentaries
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CurTM	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
EBib	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>

EHAT	Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ETR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JRE</i>	<i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
LCC	Library of Christian Classics. Philadelphia, 1953–
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
<i>McCQ</i>	<i>McCormick Quarterly</i>
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PG	Patrologia graeca [= Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca]. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886

PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
ResQ	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
SB	Sources bibliques
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SEÅ	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SO	Symbolae osloenses
SP	Sacra pagina
SSEJC	Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity
STDJ	<i>Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromily. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–1976.
Text	<i>Textus</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
VE	<i>Vox evangelica</i>
VS	<i>Verbum Salutis</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

ABSTRACT

Employing an architectural metaphor inspired by C. H. Dodd and utilizing methodology that draws from Richard B. Hays and Francis Watson, this dissertation presents a primary proposal and secondary sketch. The primary proposal is that both constitutively and rhetorically (through ironic, inferential, and indirect application), Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11. Constitutively, Rom 1:18–32 (especially vv. 22–32) hinges on the triadic interplay between “they (ex)changed” and “God gave them over,” an interplay that creates a sin–retribution sequence with an *a–ba–ba–b* pattern (vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, 28–32). Both elements of this *a–ba–ba–b* pattern derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. Rhetorically, Paul *ironically* applies the psalmic language of idolatrous “(ex)change” (cf. Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23, 25, 26b) and God's subsequent “giving-over” (cf. Ps 106[105]:41a; Rom 1:24, 26a, 28) to Gentiles. Aiding this ironic application is that Paul has cast his argument in the mold of Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality, with particular affinities to Wis 13–15. In Rom 2:1–4, however, Paul *inferentially* incorporates a hypocritical Jewish interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence through the charge of doing the “same,” a charge that possesses hermeneutical warrant in light of Israel's sins recounted in Ps 106(105). This inferential incorporation then gives way to an *indirect* application of Ps 106(105):23a,d, by means of a multifaceted allusion to Deut 9–10 throughout the double-chiasm of Rom 2:5–11.

The secondary sketch suggests that Paul's decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) reflects his exploitation of an intra-Jewish debate. This sketch has three parts. The first concerns general confusion about Jews and theriolatrous Egyptians, which makes the golden calf incident an especially sensitive subject. The second part traces the contours of a particular conversation concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106). The third part re-reads Rom 1:18–2:11 and shows how assuming the existence of this debate explains both the broad sweep and specific form of Paul's argumentation.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Project

Constructing Towers and Texts

In Luke 14:28–30 Jesus compares the one who follows him to a person who calculates the cost of building a tower, before beginning, in order to ensure that he or she can bring the project to completion. Although Jesus does not elaborate upon the various costs involved in this hypothetical construction project, one may speculate that they include the price of raw materials, such as building stones and structural supports, as well as pay for skilled laborers. Indeed, cutting corners on either might allow one to complete the tower, thus avoiding the problem upon which Jesus does focus—mockery for failing to finish due to insufficient funds—only to find that the tower would soon topple, thus exposing oneself to a different sort of mockery altogether.

The construction of any substantial piece of persuasive writing, whether a dissertation or even apostolic discourse, is analogous to a building project. One must lay the right foundation, provide the proper structural support, or substructure, as well as smooth out any rough edges for the piece of writing to stand or for the argument to succeed. Conversely, those who undertake analysis of written works must be attentive to such components of the rhetorical architecture if the argument is to be understood and assessed adequately. Complicating matters for those of us who work with ancient texts is

that, due to cultural distance and the ravages of time, we often lack the expertise to appreciate all of the architectural subtleties bequeathed to us. As a result, we sometimes quibble over the function of this or that wing of the text. At the extreme, we may even prematurely declare a particular structure unsound, when, in historical reality, it was able to bear far more weight than we realize.

Romans 1:18–32 and 2:1–11: Ethnic Inhabitants on Either Side of Bridge

This dissertation represents an attempt to engage in a kind of architectural analysis of Rom 1:18–2:11, a small but significant section of Paul’s *magnum opus* written to Roman Christians from Corinth around 57–58 CE.¹ Notwithstanding occasional and even recent protests to the contrary, there is considerable scholarly consensus about the role of Rom 1:18–2:11 in Paul’s larger argument: it is part of his overall indictment of Jews and Gentiles for sin (Rom 3:9) in support of the thesis that “no flesh will be justified from works of the Law before God; for through the Law comes knowledge of sin” (Rom 3:20).² Paul’s indictment, in turn, paves the way for the proclamation of justification by

¹ See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 85–87. For scholarly debate concerning the purposes for which Romans was written, see e.g. Karl P. Donfried, ed., *The Romans Debate* (rev. ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991); Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004); A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007). Throughout this dissertation I consistently employ the term “Christian” as an etic designation, as opposed to an emic-oriented label, such as “Christ-worshiper.” The degree to which the earliest Christ-worshipping communities in Rome anticipate later Christian orthodoxy is an important topic but one that is beyond the scope of the present project.

² This is my own rendering of the Greek text. Unless otherwise noted, all translations, whether from Greek, Hebrew, German, or French, are my own. For a lucid example of the consensus reading of Rom 1:18–3:20 with particular attention to the rhetorical features of the text, see Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric*, 105–8. Scholars who question the consensus reading of Rom 1:18–3:20, especially the coherence and cogency of various points of Paul’s argument, include: E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983), 123–35; Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (2d ed.; WUNT 29; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987), 94–119; Douglas A. Campbell, “A Rhetorical Suggestion Concerning Romans 2,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* (Eugene H. Lovering Jr.; SBLSP 34; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 140–67; idem, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of*

faith, a doctrine announced in Rom 1:16–17 and articulated in 3:21ff. Yet, even if the eventual role of Rom 1:18–2:11 is clear, the transition between 1:18–32 and 2:1–11, best conceived architecturally not as a tower but as a bridge, has caused considerable debate. Everyone agrees that some kind of a bridge exists here. The debate, so to speak, concerns the ethnic inhabitants on either side who are the targets of Paul’s polemics.

One extreme identifies the ethnic targets on both sides of the bridge with Gentiles. This view, an ancient one, is represented by Greek codices that supply the following titles (τίτλοι) for chapter divisions (κεφάλαια) at 1:18 and 2:12 respectively: “concerning judgment against Gentiles for not keeping the things of nature” (περὶ κρίσεως τῆς κατὰ ἔθνων τῶν οὐ φυλασσόντων τὰ φυσικά) and “concerning judgment against Israel for not keeping the things of the Law” (περὶ κρίσεως τῆς κατὰ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ μὴ φυλάσσοντος τὰ νόμιμα).³ According to this perspective, Paul’s tone and style may change in Rom 2:1ff. but his addressees do not. In the words of Leander E. Keck, a contemporary proponent of

Justification in Paul (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). Chapter two briefly discusses and critiques Campbell’s reading of Rom 1:18–2:11.

³ See Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (Berlin: Arthur Glaue, 1902), 1.1.462. The placement and content of the title before 2:12 were influenced by the first appearance of νόμος and its cognates in Romans, terms which are then prominent throughout (cf. 2:12[4x], 13[2x], 14[4x], 15, 17, 18, 20, 23[2x], 25[2x], 26, 27[2x]; 3:19[2x]; 20[2x], 21[2x], 27[2x], 28, 31[2x]; 4:7, 13, 14, 15[2x], 16; 5:13, 20; 6:14, 15, 19[2x]; 7:1[2x], 2[2x], 3, 4, 5, 6, 7[3x], 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23[3x], 25[2x]; 8:2[2x], 3, 4, 7; 9:4, 31; 10:4, 5; 13:8, 10). Most contemporary scholars who hold this view, in contrast, are influenced by the appearance of the term Ἰουδαῖος in Rom 2:17 and thus think it is there that Paul first turns to the Jews. See, for example, Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 128; Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 151; Leander E. Keck, *Romans* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2005), 74. An exception is Runar M. Thorsteinsson (*Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography* [ConBNT 40; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003], 159, 196–231). He claims that even in Rom 2:17–29 Paul does not indict a Jewish interlocutor, but a Gentile one who wants to be called a Jew. The degree to which this claim may be regarded as idiosyncratic is evident in the critique by A. Andrew Das (*Solving the Romans Debate*, 89–90, n. 147), who himself regards the interlocutor in Rom 2:17–29 as a Jew even though he argues that Romans is directed to an exclusively Gentile Christian audience (see *ibid.*, 87–89).

this view, “Where 1:18-32 *described* the Gentiles, at 2:1 Paul begins *confronting* them, diatribe style, with the inescapable consequences of God’s righteous judgment on deeds....”⁴

The other extreme identifies the ethnic targets especially with Jews, regarding the indictment of Gentiles as more or less assumed. This position is advocated by Jouette M. Bassler.⁵ She contends that a division of Paul’s argument into an initial sortie against Gentiles in Rom 1:18–32, followed by an attack against Jews in 2:1ff. ignores, among other things, the “unambiguous allusions to Jer 2:11 and especially Ps 106:20 (LXX 105:20)” in Rom 1:23, “texts which speak of Israel’s apostasy and idolatry at the golden calf incident (Exodus 32).”⁶ In light of such allusions, Bassler further contends that although in Rom 1:18–32 Paul “employs an argument traditionally directed against the Gentiles, he clearly signals that it was also, if not primarily, appropriate to the Jews.”⁷

The majority of contemporary scholars fall in between these extremes. Some, like Robert Jewett, regard Rom 1:18–2:11 as directed, at various points throughout, to both

⁴ Keck, *Romans*, 74, italics his.

⁵ Jouette M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBLDS 59; Chico: Scholars, 1982), 121–37; idem, “Divine Impartiality in Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” *NovT* 26 (1984): 43–58. See also G. Bouwman, “Noch einmal Römer 1,21–32,” *Bib* 54 (1973): 411–14 [esp. 414]; Wiard Popkes, “Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32,” *NTS* 28 (1982): 490–501 [esp. 498–500]; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP 6; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996), 63–87 [esp. 62–63].

⁶ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 122. Bassler argues for the unity of Rom 1:16–2:11 (pp. 123–37), proposing a ring-structure for Rom 1:16–2:10 (cf. p. 199) which highlights the centrality of divine impartiality in Rom 2:11. She cites the study of Ulrich Luz (“Zum Aufbau von Röm 1–8,” *TZ* 25 [1969]: 161–81 [esp. 167]) in support of the view that Rom 1:16–17 is to be regarded as a “thematic statement,” which “can form the organic conclusion of one section while simultaneously serving a transitional function to the theme of the next” (p. 127; cf. p. 253, n. 25). Thus Bassler recognizes the legitimacy of focusing on Rom 1:18–2:11 as a single structural unit.

⁷ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 122.

Jews and Gentiles.⁸ Others, such as C. K. Barrett, consider Paul's thought, beginning in Rom 2:1–11, and including vv. 12–16, as applicable to both Jews and Gentiles.⁹ There is thus a partial turn at Rom 2:1, which becomes complete at v. 17 with the introduction of a Jewish interlocutor. Most, however, make the very division to which Bassler objects: Rom 1:18–32 is regarded, primarily, as an excoriation of Gentile idolatry and immorality while Rom 2:1ff. is regarded as an indictment of a representative Jewish interlocutor whose identity does not become explicit until v. 17.¹⁰ Joseph A. Fitzmyer advocates this position.¹¹ While he recognizes the allusions to Ps 106(105):20 and Jer 2:11 in Rom 1:23, Fitzmyer argues that such allusions do not mean that Paul “envisages Jewish humanity as well in vv 18–32.”¹² Rather, Paul “is simply extrapolating from such incidents in the history of the chosen people and applying the ideas to the pagan world.”¹³ To substantiate

⁸ *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 148–210 [esp. 152]. See also Franz J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary* (trans. Harold Knight; Cleveland: World Publishing, 1961), 59–77; Adolf Schlatter, *Romans: The Righteousness of God* (trans. Siegfried Schatzmann; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 28–66; German original: idem, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1935). Schlatter regards Romans 1:18–2:16 as directed, throughout, to the “world,” i.e. Jews and Gentiles (see esp. pp. 30–31). Note, however, that in answering his own question about the person to whom Paul's message of justification by faith is addressed, Schlatter implicitly endorses the view that Rom 1:18–32 is directed especially to Gentiles (see p. 28).

⁹ *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 42–43; idem, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2d ed.; BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1991), 41–42.

¹⁰ The reason for the qualification “primarily,” in relation to the excoriation of Gentile idolatry and immorality in Rom 1:18–32, is because many interpreters discern clues in this text that indicate the turn Paul's argument will take in 2:1ff. For example, Tobin (*Paul's Rhetoric*, 110) points to the absence of the word “Gentiles” and the emphasis on God's wrath being revealed against “all” (i.e. Jewish and Gentile) impiety and wickedness in Rom 1:18.

¹¹ *Romans*, 270–71. For scholars who endorsed this view prior to 1982, see Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 249, n. 1. More recently, see, for example, Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 96–97.

¹² Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 270–71.

¹³ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 271. Note that Schreiner (*Romans* [Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998], 81–82), who shares Fitzmyer's general view of Rom 1:18–32

his view that Rom 1:18–32 is especially directed toward Gentiles, Fitzmyer points to parallels with Wis 13:1–9 and 14:22–31. Both authors, for example, excoriate those who are regarded as foolish by nature and see a connection between idolatry and immorality.¹⁴ When it comes to identifying the interlocutor of Rom 2:1–11 as a Jew, parallels with Wisdom continue to play a central role. If before the parallels were synonymous, or nearly synonymous,¹⁵ beginning in 2:1 they are antithetical. Citing Wis 11:9–11, 23; 12:22; 15:1–3 in relation to Rom 2:1–11, Fitzmyer states, “Thus when Paul addresses his Jewish interlocutor, he thinks in terms of the mode of Jewish existence depicted in the Book of Wisdom.”¹⁶ In other words, the representative Jew whom Paul indicts in Rom 2:1–11 subscribes to the conception of Diaspora Jewish identity in Wis 11–19. As we shall see, Fitzmyer is far from alone in this construal.

Introducing the Four Pavement Stones

What this brief survey of scholarly positions highlights is the importance of the rhetorical bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11 and the significance of texts associated with that bridge, especially Rom 1:23, Ps 106(105):20, and Wis 11–19, to understanding the architecture of Paul’s argument. With regard to Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11, there are, I suggest, four interlocking pavement stones which constitute the rhetorical

as directed toward Gentiles (he even provides five arguments to this end) and Rom 2:1ff. as directed toward Jews, and who also shares Fitzmyer’s particular view of Rom 1:23 as applying language about Jewish idolatry to Gentiles, nonetheless states that “The allusions to the idolatry of the Jews in Rom. 1:23 can be understood as foreshadowing chapter 2.”

¹⁴ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 271–72. See also Schreiner, *Romans*, 81.

¹⁵ For example, Fitzmyer (*Romans*, 273) says that “Paul may ... go beyond the teaching in Wisdom when he admits that pagans did have some vague, unformulated knowledge about God.”

¹⁶ *Romans*, 298. Note that it is not until Rom 2:4 that Fitzmyer discusses Wis 15:1. See p. 301.

bridge and need to be placed properly: (1) A Problematic Particle. Is the Διό of Rom 2:1 inferential, non-inferential, or is it to be identified as part of an interpolation and consequently excised from the text? (2) An Uncertain Similarity. To what do τὰ ... αὐτά (“the same things”) and the associated τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) in Rom 2:1, 2, 3 refer? Are these referents to be taken retrospectively, (referring to 1:18–32 as a whole or to 1:28–32), prospectively (referring to 2:17–24), or some combination of the two? (3) An Unidentified Interlocutor. Is the interlocutor whom Paul indicts a Jew, a Gentile, or a generic judge, whether Jew or Gentile? (4) A Possible Dialogue Partner. Is Paul engaged in a particular dialogue with Wis 11–19 (esp. chaps. 13–15), or is he merely drawing upon similar traditions? If he is, indeed, engaged in a dialogue with Wisdom, is it a subversive one, as Fitzmyer and many others suggest? Specifically, is the interlocutor whom Paul opposes in Rom 2:1–11 (cf. esp. v. 4) the Jewish interlocutor of Wis 15:1–6?

Interpreting the Four Pavement Stones

Interlocking Stones

One of the concerns of this study is to suggest that any adequate account of the rhetorical bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11 must consider the manner in which all four pavement stones interlock; for failure to correlate them correctly leads to an uneven journey across the otherwise smooth pathway laid down by Paul. These stones are related in the sense that the determination of one affects the determination of the others. Thus Fitzmyer, for example, draws a common connection between the Jewish identity of the interlocutor (pavement stone three) and Paul’s dialogue with Wisdom (pavement stone four). The challenge for this interpretation is to relate it to the other two pavement

stones. If, for instance, Διό retains its inferential force, then the question becomes how does the apparent excoriation of Gentile idolatry and immorality in Rom 1:18–32 provide the basis for indicting a Jewish interlocutor?¹⁷ Moreover, what precisely does Paul mean when he charges this Jewish interlocutor with doing τὰ αὐτά (“the same things”) and τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) in Rom 2:1, 2, 3? Is this charge, as would seem an obvious inference, to be related to the use of τὰ τοιαῦτα and αὐτά in Rom 1:32 and consequently associated with the improper actions of Rom 1:28ff.? If so, then is Paul’s indictment of the interlocutor in Rom 2:1ff. to be further related to what is often identified as the “sin–retribution” sequence of Rom 1:18–32, one in which, as Douglas J. Moo observes, in its third and final portrayal (vv. 28–32) Paul “traces sins of inhumanity, of man’s hatred of his fellow man in all its terrible manifestations,” to the root sin of idolatry (cf. vv. 23, 25)?¹⁸

It is precisely this implication that the interlocutor of Rom 2:1ff. is guilty of idolatry that leads Philip F. Esler to identify him as a Gentile.¹⁹ The challenge for Esler’s interpretation, and those like it, is to account for pavement stone four, the possible dialogue with Wisdom. Esler engages in a standard comparison of Paul’s argument in

¹⁷ Theodor Zahn (*Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* [1st and 2d ed.; Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Leipzig: Deichert, 1910], 104, n. 2; idem, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* [3d ed.; Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Leipzig: Deichert, 1925], 106, n. 2) expressed this criticism as follows:

Die Meinung, daß hier der Jude oder ein Jude angeredet werde, erscheint besonders unbegreiflich in Verbindung mit der anderen, daß 1,18–32 die religiöse und moralische Entartung der heidnischen Völker geschildert sei. Es ergäbe sich der unglaubliche Gedanke: „Darum weil die Heiden keine Entschuldigung für ihre Gottlosigkeit und Unsittlichkeit vorbringen können, entbehrt der Jude, welcher sich ein sittliches Urteil erlaubt, jeder Entschuldigung.“

¹⁸ Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 117.

¹⁹ Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, 151.

Rom 1:18–32 with Wis 13:1, 8–10; however, when it comes to Rom 2:1–11, he avoids any reference to Wisdom.²⁰ This omission is more than a minor oversight. As noted above, Fitzmyer is not the only one to connect these texts. The parallels between Wis 15:1–3 and Rom 2:4, in particular, are so striking that Brendan Byrne speaks for many when he says, “So close, in fact, are the contacts in language and ideas that it is hard to believe that Paul is not writing with Wisdom specifically in mind.”²¹ Even Ernst Käsemann, who regards the parallels between Wisdom and Romans as evidence of common tradition, not literary dependence, is compelled to claim in his interpretation of Rom 2:1–11 that “What follows can be understood only as a polemic against the Jewish tradition which comes out most clearly and with much the same vocabulary in Wis 15:1 ff.”²² For both Byrne and Käsemann, the parallels between Rom 2:1–11 and Wisdom are central to their identification of the interlocutor as a Jew. With this return to the connection between the identity of the interlocutor and the possible dialogue with Wisdom, I have now come full circle in my claim regarding the importance and interlocking nature of these four pavement stones to the bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11. This importance and interrelationship will be explored further in chapter two.

²⁰ Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, 145–52.

²¹ Byrne, *Romans*, 81–82. Note that Byrne also mentions Wis 12:22 and references Wis 16:9–11 in relation to Rom 2:4.

²² Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Geoffrey Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 35, 53–54. Similarly, Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT 6.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1978), 96–97, 124.

Textual Context

A second concern of this study is to insist on the need to relate one's analysis of Rom 2:1 to *both* 1:18–32 *and* 2:1–11. This point, which seems obvious enough, is worth stressing since it is frequently neglected. If, for example, the interlocutor of Rom 2:1 is identified as a Gentile, then how does this interpretation account for the language that Paul uses to characterize this interlocutor subsequent to v. 1? Even if one denies a direct connection between Rom 2:4 and Wis 15:1, for instance, does it make sense that Paul indicts a hypocritical *Gentile* moralist for despising God's kindness and patience, attributes that a Jew in a covenantal relationship might be especially prone to presume upon and thus despise? Can a Gentile identification account for other parallels between Rom 2:1–5 and Jewish literature, especially *Pss. Sol.* 15.8; Tob 4:9–10; and Deut 9:27?²³ If the answer to both of these questions is yes, then why does Paul stress punishment and reward for the *Jew* first in Rom 2:9, 10? Looking in the opposite direction, why does Paul choose to articulate the initial idolatrous exchange of Rom 1:23 utilizing language drawn from Ps 106(105):20 concerning Israel's fall into idolatry with the golden calf? More broadly, do not the parallels between Rom 1:18–32 and other Hellenistic Jewish excoriations of Gentile idolatry and immorality (e.g. *Let. Aris.* 128–171; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81; *Sib. Or.* 3.8–45; Wis 13–15) suggest that the interlocutor whom Paul opposes is a Diaspora Jew in agreement with such sentiments?

Yet, identifying the interlocutor as a Jew has its own problems. The initial one is accounting for the very general way in which Paul characterizes this interlocutor in Rom

²³ For these parallels between Rom 2:1–5 and the Jewish literature cited, see especially James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1988), 81, 83–84.

2:1, “O man, everyone who judges” (ὁ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων). Looking to the text that precedes, there is, as I noted, the question of how an apparent excoriation of Gentile idolatry and immorality provides the basis for indicting a Jewish interlocutor. If one turns to the evocation of the golden calf incident in Rom 1:23 to answer this question (as do Bassler and others), then why does Paul in this same verse also appear to draw upon language that is, at the very least, reminiscent of Gen 1:20–27 and thus applicable to Gentiles as well? Further, if the “moral purity of the Jews was their legitimate boast,” as Barrett claims, then how could the depiction of gross sexual immorality stemming from idolatry in Rom 1:24–27 be convincingly related to Jews?²⁴

Such problems with the Gentile and Jewish interpretations might incline one to regard the interlocutor as a generic judge, whether Jew or Gentile. This view, however, has difficulty accounting for the Jew/Gentile polarity that pervades Romans (1:16; 2:9, 10; 3:9, 29; 9:24; 10:12),²⁵ among other problems, as we shall see. The point now is not to argue for or against a particular identification of the interlocutor but to illustrate the need to relate one’s interpretation of the bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11 to the larger textual context. This holds true for all four pavement stones.

²⁴ Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, 43–44 (1957 version); idem, *Epistle to the Romans*, 42 (1991 version). See also Dunn (*Romans 1–8*, 80), who states, “A line of argument which accused Jews of idolatry and homosexual practice would be unlikely to commend much support, either from the judgmental Jew or from the God-worshipping Gentile who had previously been attracted to Judaism, particularly because of the sublimity of its idea of God and of its high moral standards.”

²⁵ Although in Romans Paul frequently pairs Ἰουδαῖος (“Jew”) with Ἕλληνα (“Greek”), not ἔθνος (“Gentile”) (cf. 1:16; 2:9, 10; 3:9; 10:12), the manner in which the phrase Ἕλλησίν τε καὶ βαρβάρους (“to both Greeks and Barbarians”) in Rom 1:14 follows directly from the reference to ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν (“among the rest of the Gentiles”) in v. 13 suggests that Ἕλληνα functions as a synecdoche for Greeks and Barbarians, that is, Gentiles. This inference is confirmed by the parallel comparisons between Ἰουδαῖοι and ἔθνη in Rom 3:29; 9:24 (cf. also 2:17, 24).

Cultural and Historical Context

A third concern of this study is to situate the references to animal idols, in general, and to the golden calf incident, in particular, within the wider cultural and historical context of the Diaspora. As John M. G. Barclay observes, “A broad range of evidence suggests that it was commonly believed in the Hellenistic–Roman era that the Judaeans,” or Jews, “were originally of Egyptian stock.”²⁶ This belief was based, in part, on the shared practices of circumcision and food taboos among Jews and Egyptians (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.137–142; Philo, *Spec.* 1.2; *QG* 3.47; Herodotus 2.37–38, 104; Diodorus Siculus 1.28; 3.32). These common rituals, however, masked a crucial distinction: whereas Egyptian food taboos reflected reverence for animals, Jewish abstention did not (cf. esp. *Let. Aris.* 144). Indeed, the idea of worshiping “irrational animals” was an abomination to Diaspora Jews and consequently this practice was singled out by them for particular disdain (Wis 15:18–19; *Let. Aris.* 138; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.224b–225; Philo, *Decal.* 76–80), undoubtedly fueled by the desire to differentiate themselves from the Egyptians with whom they were often confused and thus associated.

It is in this context that the golden calf incident (Exod 32:1–34:35; Deut 9:7–10:11) becomes especially problematic for notions of Diaspora Jewish identity; for in this event, intertwined with the giving of the Law, Israel finds herself involved not only in idolatry but also in worship of an animal image. Although Wis 15:14–19, for example, distinguishes between idolatry and the worship of animals themselves, or their idolatry

²⁶ John M. G. Barclay, “The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus’s *Against Apion*,” in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (ed. John M. G. Barclay; Library of Second Temple Studies 45; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 109–27[114].

(castigating Egyptians for being guilty of both), it is easy to see how worship of an animal idol might be regarded as a form of theriolatry, the kind of theriolatry that Philo explicitly and repeatedly associates with “imitation of Egyptian vanity” (Αἰγυπτιακοῦ μίμημα τύφου; *Mos.* 2.270; *Spec.* 3.125) or the like (*Mos.* 2.161; *Spec.* 1.79). Even if, as we shall see, Philo downplays this lapse into Egyptian vanity by disassociating it from the giving of the Law and emphasizing the Levites’ election to the priesthood, Josephus, writing from Rome, apparently found the episode so troublesome that he omits it entirely from his *Jewish Antiquities*. I shall suggest that the problematic nature of the golden calf incident for Diaspora Judaism is precisely what Paul exploits through his direct, if allusive, use of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23 and related evocation of Deut 9–10 throughout Rom 2:5–11. I shall further suggest that in subtly invoking the golden calf incident Paul may have been participating in a particular conversation about Jewish identity, one involving Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106).

Proposal

Aligning the Pavement Stones

It is now time to articulate the proposal that lies at the heart of this study as well as sketch a larger context in which that proposal may be situated. In the first place, I shall argue for a particular configuration of the four pavement stones that I have identified. Once the structure of Rom 1:18–32 is properly understood, especially the sin–retribution sequence portrayed through the *a–ba–ba–b* alternation of (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, and 28–32, the δῖό of Rom 2:1 (stone one) becomes clearly inferential; and τὰ

αὐτά (“the same things”) as well as τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) of Rom 2:1–3 (stone two) transparently refer to the improper actions enumerated in Rom 1:28–32, actions that have their origin in idolatry (Rom 1:23, 25). A number of factors, in addition to parallels with Wisdom, coalesce to suggest that the unidentified interlocutor (stone three) is a Jew, who is implicated in the initial idolatrous (and theriolatrous!) “change” of Rom 1:23, a verse about which I shall have more to say momentarily. As for the possible dialogue with Wisdom (stone four), I shall argue that, at the very least, Wis 13–15 represents the kind of tradition Paul is engaging. This, as we shall see, is hardly a controversial claim.

Analyzing the Textual Substructure

With the four pavement stones properly aligned, the way is clear to analyze the texts on either side of the rhetorical bridge. In short, these interlocking stones combine to create an interconnected transition between Paul’s indictment of Gentiles and Jews, one that places particular importance on Rom 1:23. Underneath and extending beyond the pavement stones in both directions is an argumentative substructure formed by Ps 106(105), especially vv. 20, 41a. This psalm plays a constitutive and rhetorical role in Rom 1:18–2:11, conferring, among other things, hermeneutical cogency upon the idolatrous and immoral charges leveled against Paul’s fellow Jewish interlocutor.

Importance of Romans 1:23

The interlocking pavement stones, as stated, form an interconnected, albeit abrupt, transition between Paul’s indictment of Gentiles in Rom 1:18–32 and an unidentified Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:1–11. The transition is interconnected because Paul’s charge of doing τὰ αὐτά (“the same things”) and τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”)

retrospectively, or inferentially, links the Jewish interlocutor with actions that have their origin in the idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23:

Table 1. Rom 1:23

²³ καὶ ἡλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνοσ φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετῶν.	²³ And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of a corruptible human being and of birds and of four-footed animals and of serpents.
--	--

This key verse is a conflation of language drawn from Ps 106(105):20 and Gen 1:20–27.

Ps 106(105):20, καὶ ἡλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον (“And they changed their glory for the likeness of a calf that eats grass”), is part of a passage recounting *Israel’s* idolatry with the golden calf. Although Rom 1:23 utilizes terminology from Ps 106(105):20 (καὶ ἡλλάξαν[το] τὴν δόξαν ... ἐν ὁμοιώματι [“And they changed the glory ... for the likeness”]), Paul omits the part of the verse concerning the calf itself and substitutes in its place human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27, a text, deriving from Israel’s creation account, that witnesses to a time prior to ethnic divisions and thus includes *Gentiles* within its scope.²⁷ Paul’s conflation, then, through omission and substitution, initially commends an ironic application of Ps 106(105):20 to Gentile idolatry. Nonetheless, the foundation is also thereby laid for Paul’s later application of Ps 106(105) to a Jewish interlocutor.

Corroboration for the claim that Rom 1:23 plays a part in Paul’s indictment of an unidentified Jewish interlocutor, beginning in Rom 2:1, may be found in Rom 2:7, 10.

²⁷ This is not to imply that Rom 1:23, in particular, or Rom 1:18–32, in general, concern Adam, as suggested by many (e.g. Morna D. Hooker, “Adam in Romans 1,” *NTS* 6 [1960]: 297–306; idem, “A Further Note on Romans 1,” *NTS* 13 [1966]: 181–83; James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 90–93). I shall have more to say about this in chapter five.

Among other lexical affinities, to be detailed shortly, these verses, for the first time since Rom 1:23, employ the term δόξα (“glory”). In Rom 2:7, those who seek δόξα, along with other qualities, receive eternal life, while in Rom 2:10 δόξα is no longer part of the goal but part of the reward for those who do good. The implication is that the pathway back to God entails pursuing as a goal and receiving as a gift the δόξα that was lost in Rom 1:23. Significantly, the term δόξα in this verse derives from Ps 106(105):20.

Substructure of Psalm 106(105)

The role of Ps 106(105) in Paul’s argument, however, extends beyond the rhetorically significant allusion to the golden calf incident. Both expressions in the *a–ba–ba–b* interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in Rom 1:22–32 derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. The former verse, as noted, is part of the account of the golden calf incident in Ps 106(105):19–23, one that conflates the versions found in Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10, and serves, among other things, as the central member of seven sins committed by Israel outside the Land in Ps 106(105):7–33. Following an elaborate chiasm of key-words in Ps 106(105):34–40, one that highlights the “Canaanization of Israel,”²⁸ including idolatry and child sacrifice, the latter verse recounts how the LORD παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν (“gave them over into the hands of the Gentiles”), an act that is both punitive and preservative. These two verses thus occur at key junctures within Ps 106(105) and their constitutive role in the structure of Rom 1:22–32 as well as rhetorical

²⁸ The phrase “Canaanization of Israel” comes from Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* (2d ed.; WBC 21; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 68. On the chiasm of key-words, see Pierre Auffret (“‘Afin que nous rendions grâce à ton nom’: Étude structurale du Psaume 106,” *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 11 [1994]: 75–96[83–84]) and the discussion in chapter four.

importance to the indictment of Rom 2:1–11 suggest that Paul intends to evoke the whole psalm.

In fact, the account of the golden calf incident in Ps 106(105) plays a role in Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 2:1–11. We have already noted that Paul's charge of doing "the same things" and "such things" inferentially links the Jewish interlocutor with actions that have their origin in the idolatrous charge of Rom 1:23, itself an allusion to the account of the calf in Ps 106(105):19–23. In Rom 2:5–11, this inferential application of Ps 106(105) becomes an indirect application. The twofold reference in Ps 106(105):23 to the LORD's desire to ἐξολεθρεύω ("destroy") Israel for her idolatrous worship derives from the version of the golden calf incident in Deut 9–10, where the verb ἐξολεθρεύω occurs 10x (Deut 9:3, 4, 5, 8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10) and is central to the cautionary comparison between the ἀσέβεια ("impiety") of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land (Deut 9:4, 5), *who would be destroyed*, and Israel's ἀσεβήματα ("impious actions"), chief among them calf-adoration (Deut 9:27), which *nearly led to her destruction*. It is this deuteronomic version of the golden calf incident that Paul evokes throughout Rom 2:5–11. The evocation, as we shall see, is a consequence of the way in which Rom 2:5–11 is framed, its emphasis on judgment according to deeds, and multiple affinities between the two texts.

Thus constitutively as well as rhetorically, through ironic, inferential, and indirect application, the latter by means of Deut 9–10, Ps 106(105) constitutes the substructure of Rom 1:18–2:11 and Paul's argumentation should, as a result, be understood in terms of the support offered by this psalm. When this is done, Paul's charge that the *Jewish*

interlocutor is guilty of “the same things,” that is, idolatrous and immoral actions, acquires cogency in so far as his thought is governed, not by empirical observations,²⁹ but by hermeneutical considerations based upon an understanding of Jewish identity rooted in Ps 106(105). Furthermore, Ps 106(105) provides a metaleptic corrective to the attitude of the interlocutor (cf. esp. Ps 106[105]:6; Rom 2:4) and may even preview key developments in Romans, namely the need for atoning intervention (Ps 106[105]:23, 30; Rom 3:21–26) and the notion of righteousness being reckoned to descendants (Ps 106[105]:31; Rom 4:18–25).³⁰

Reading the Textual Surface

The preceding focus upon substructural analysis, while necessary to understand Paul’s argument properly, also has the potential of causing one to lose sight of the flow of the argument as a whole. Thus, at the risk of engaging in a certain degree of repetition, I shall summarize how such an understanding of the underlying architecture of Rom 1:18–2:11 facilitates a coherent reading of the textual surface. Even as we concentrate on that surface, however, we shall see that reading Rom 1:18–2:11 entails interaction with other texts, not only Ps 106(105) and Deut 9–10 but also Wis 13–15, among others. Finally, it should be borne in mind that the exegetical rationale for the interpretation that follows is spelled out more fully in the course of the dissertation, especially chapter five.

²⁹ *Contra* Simon J. Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 211–12.

³⁰ For the notion of “metalepsis” (the citation/allusion/echo of an older text in a newer one to evoke not only explicit but also implicit parallels), see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University, 1989), 14–33, as well as the discussion in chapter three.

Romans 1:18–32: Ironic Application of Psalm 106(105)

Having declared his unashamed stance regarding the salvific power of the gospel for *both Jew and Greek* in Rom 1:16–17,³¹ Paul begins his explication of that gospel by focusing on the revelation of, basis for, and precipitating cause as well as results of God’s wrath in 1:18–32. The continued universal dimension of Paul’s thought is intimated in v. 18a: God’s heavenly wrath has been revealed against *all* (πᾶς) human impiety and unrighteousness. The basis for this wrath, according to vv. 18b–21, is unrighteous suppression of the knowledge of God, initially designated simply as the “truth” (ἀλήθεια) in v. 18b. Because of the intelligibility of God’s revelation in creation, including his attributes, knowledge of God is universal and humans who suppress that knowledge are therefore “without excuse” (ἀναπολογήτος; vv. 19–20). According to v. 21, *although they knew God*, humans neither “glorified” (δοξάζω) nor gave thanks to him but instead became vain, or distorted, in their “reasoning” (διαλογισμός) and their hearts, which thereby “lacked understanding” (ἄσύνετος), became darkened.

With such emphases, v. 21, particularly in retrospect, performs three related roles. First, it concludes the portion of Paul’s argument concerning the basis for God’s wrath (vv. 18b–21), namely human culpability for suppressing the knowledge of God available in creation. Second, by mentioning failure to “glorify” God, v. 21 prepares for the next section, vv. 22–32, which focuses on the precipitating cause for divine wrath, an idolatrous “change” (ἀλλάσσω) involving the “glory” (δόξα) of God, and the morally

³¹ On the relationship between Rom 1:16–17 and 1:18–32, see Jonathan A. Linebaugh, “Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11,” *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–37[224–27]. On the use of Ἑλλήν as synecdoche for Gentiles, see n. 25.

degenerative process that results. Third, v. 21 anticipates other key elements of vv. 22–32. The portrayal of distorted reasoning, for example, is a theme to which vv. 28–32 returns.

The precipitating cause for God’s wrath and morally degenerative process that results from it are given intricate expression throughout Rom 1:22–32 in the *a–ba–ba–b* “(ex)change”/“giving-over” pattern of vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, and 28–32. The foundational idolatrous “change” of the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of a corruptible human and of animals in Rom 1:22–23 (*a1*) recalls *both* the inglorious change that occurred in the golden calf incident, according to Ps 106(105):20 (cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6), *and* an inversion of the creation order in Gen 1:20–27. Although the subsequent “giving-over” of idolaters in vv. 24, 26a, 28 further recalls God’s response to *Israelite* sin in Ps 106(105):41a, two considerations suggest that, in spite of the inclusive “*all*” of Rom 1:18a and the conspicuous absence of identifying references to “Gentiles” (ἔθνη/ἔθνικοί),³² Paul intended for these allusions to Ps 106(105) to be *initially* and also *genuinely* (cf. Rom 3:9) interpreted as ironic applications of this psalm to non-Jewish humanity. The first is that Paul’s allusion to Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23 omits reference to the calf itself and substitutes in its place human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27, a text that includes Gentiles within its purview. The second consideration concerns genre. Paul has cast his argument in the mold of Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality, in general (*Let. Aris.*

³² Tobin (*Paul’s Rhetoric*, 110) rightly draws attention to the manner in which both of these elements “set the stage for Paul’s later arguments about the equally sinful status of Jews and Gentiles,” although he regards the turn to a Jewish interlocutor as not taking place until Rom 2:17.

128–171; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81; *Sib. Or.* 3.8–45), and perhaps Wis 13–15, in particular.

Like Wisdom (cf. 14:12, 27), for example, Rom 1:22–32 first concentrates on the sexual immorality that results from idolatry and then secondly on the multitude of vices that result from idolatry as well.

Sexual immorality comes sharply into focus by the end of Rom 1:24–27. The first “giving-over” in v. 24 (*b1*) is to desires to dishonor one’s body (ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ... τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα), a punitive measure, Paul stresses once more in v. 25 (*a2*), for persons who have idolatrously “exchanged” Creator for creature. The second “giving-over” in v. 26a (*b2*) then returns to dishonorable desires, or passions (πάθη ἀτιμίας), and the third “exchange” of vv. 26b–27 (*a3*), rather than returning yet again to idolatry, clarifies the precise nature of these passions: same sex acts among both women and men. With the final “giving-over” of Rom 1:28–32 (*b3*), Paul shifts the focus from dishonorable desires and their outcome, sexual immorality, to undiscerning minds (ἀδόκιμον νοῦν) and their outcome, improper actions (ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα; v. 28). These improper actions are then detailed in a vice list (vv. 29–31; cf. Wis 14:22–26).

Rom 1:32, the final verse in the excoriation of idolatry and immorality, prepares for the impending transition to indicting an unidentified Jewish interlocutor. Paul refers to persons who not only “practice such things” (οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες), in spite of their knowledge of the righteous requirement of God, but also, while “doing the same” (αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν), commend other “practitioners” (τοῖς πράσσουσιν) of vice. By drawing attention to cavalier disregard for God, Paul aims to elicit a judgmental response in the implied audience of such polemic, self-identifying Hellenistic Jews (whether Christ-

followers or not and including proselytes) who place their own sin in a different category than Gentiles. The emphasis on “doing the same” and “practicing such things” associates these actions with Rom 1:28b and thus, in turn, with the sin–retribution sequence expressed in the “(ex)change”/“giving-over” pattern, both parts of which derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. Paul intends for biblically-fluent Jews, attuned to listening for the kind of auditory markers provided by this pattern, to recognize all along that these vices have their origin in the foundational idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23, itself an ironic application of the golden calf incident, as recounted in Ps 106(105), to Gentiles.³³

Romans 2:1–4: Inferential Application of Psalm 106(105)

Beginning in Rom 2:1, however, Paul exploits the moral outrage that he has just provoked. From the preceding excoriation of idolatry and immorality, Paul draws the conclusion (διό) that his interlocutor is also “without excuse” (ἀναπολόγητος; cf. v. 20) because he condemns others for actions that he himself commits. Although the Jewish identity of the interlocutor does not become explicit until v. 17, it is already implicit here, as suggested both by the turn upon the implied audience of such polemic and by the subversive manner in which Paul engages traditional Jewish viewpoints.³⁴ In contrast to the belief expressed in Wis 15:1–2, for example, “But you, our God, are kind and true [and] patient” (Σὺ δέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, χρηστὸς καὶ ἀληθής, μακρόθυμος) such that “even if we sin, we are yours” (καὶ ... ἐὰν ἁμαρτώμεν, σοὶ ἐσμεν), Paul asks the interlocutor in Rom 2:4 if he despises the “kindness” (χρηστότης) and “patience” (μακροθυμία) of God,

³³ On the notions of “biblical fluency” and “auditory markers,” see the discussion in chapter three.

³⁴ Besides the example about to be discussed, cf. also Rom 2:3, 5; Tob 4:8–10; *Pss. Sol.* 9.5; 15.8.

unaware that God's "kindness" (χρηστός) leads to "repentance" (μετάνοια). Paul's question may, in fact, be a sarcastic attempt to expose yet further hypocrisy, since Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19, with particular attention to Gentiles, acknowledge the importance of repentance if God is to overlook sin.

Whether or not Paul's question is sarcastic along these lines, the repeated stress on the interlocutor "doing" or "practicing" "the same" as well as "such things" in Rom 2:1–3 provides a clear link with 1:28b, 32 and, in turn, inferentially incorporates him into the preceding sin–retribution sequence. The *Jewish* interlocutor, in other words, is being indicted for actions that have their origin in the idolatrous "change" of v. 23 and that are also a manifestation of God's subsequent "giving-over" of such idolaters, both elements of which, once again, derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. With the Jewish interlocutor swept up into this sin–retribution sequence, the application of Ps 106(105) loses its ironic overtones. Moreover, viewed in light of the understanding of Jewish identity in Ps 106(105), the implication of Paul's rhetorical turn, that a Jewish interlocutor is guilty of not only idolatry but also Gentile-like behavior, including sexual immorality and improper actions, has *hermeneutical* warrant. As we shall see, by virtue of allusions to the Baal of Peor episode and Israel's "fornication" (πορνεύω) inside the Land during the Judges period, Ps 106(105):28–31, 39 implicates the interlocutor in sexual immorality. Although Ps 106(105):39 does not mention same sex acts, this verse occurs in a context in which the pronounced emphasis on Israel's imitation of the Gentiles, including idolatrous shedding of innocent blood and other defiling works (vv.

34–40), provides implicit grounds for associating a Jew with any sexually illicit acts ascribed to Gentiles, not to mention improper acts in general.

Romans 2:5–11: Indirect Application of Psalm 106(105)

Throughout Rom 2:5–11, Paul returns to Ps 106(105):19–23, the passage that forms the intertextual origin for the idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23; Paul does so not directly, however, but indirectly. As noted, Ps 106(105):19–23 is an account of the golden calf incident that conflates the versions found in Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10. Having alluded to a part of the passage that derives from Exodus (Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23; cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6), Paul now turns directly, even if evocatively, to Deuteronomy, perhaps wishing to mediate as well as call to mind elements of an interpretive tradition that provided a rationale for the LORD’s desire, expressed twice in Ps 106(105):23 and deriving from Deuteronomy (9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10), to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) Israel because of the calf. This interpretive tradition, if it existed, focused on the hermeneutical significance of three verses: Deut 9:27; 10:16, 17. In Deut 9:27, Moses intercedes for Israel by asking the LORD not to “look upon the hardness [σκληρότητα] of this people and their impious actions [ἀσεβήματα] and sins.” The attribution of “impious action” (ἀσέβημα) to Israel *both* explains why the LORD desired to destroy Israel *and* equates her conduct with that of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land, whose impending “destruction” (ἐξολεθρεύω) for “impiety” (ἀσέβεια) in Deut 9:1–6 prompts the deuteronomic rehearsal of the golden calf, spanning Deut 9:7–10:11. In the midst of the paraenesis that follows (10:12–22), Deut 10:16 returns to Israel’s hardened-character, providing the antidote for this problem: “Circumcise your hard-heart

[σκληροκαρδίαν] and stiffen your neck no longer [οὐ σκληρυνεῖτε ἔτι].” The statement of divine impartiality that comes next in Deut 10:17, “For the LORD your God ... does not wonder [θαυμάζει] at a person and by no means takes a bribe,” especially in light of the preceding comparison between Gentile and Jewish impiety, serves as a warning that failure to circumcise one’s hardened-heart would lead to judgment, perhaps even destruction.

In Rom 2:5–11, Paul evokes all three of these verses from Deuteronomy (9:27; 10:16, 17), as well as the idea implicit in their association, equitable judgment, or judgment according to works. The likelihood that Paul may have drawn on an interpretive tradition is enhanced by parallels in Philo and Sirach. Beginning in Rom 2:5, Paul’s characterization of the interlocutor as possessing a “hard ... and unrepentant heart” (σκληρότητα ... καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν) conflates Deut 9:27; 10:16, a conflation that is initially discernible because the specific term for “hardness” (σκληρότης) occurs only here in the NT and, besides Deut 9:27, just three other times in the LXX, none of which have relevance to the Pauline context (cf. 2 Sam 22:6; Isa 4:6; 28:27). Moreover, although the “hard”- (σκληρ-) root in verbal form often appears with “heart” (καρδία) in the OT (e.g., Exod 4:21; 7:3, 22, etc.), the association of one of its nominal forms with “heart,” whether in the compound “hard-heart” (σκληροκαρδία) or as two separate nouns, occurs only four times: Deut 10:16; Eccl 7:25; Sir 16:10; Jer 4:4, the latter two of which refer back to Deut 10:16.³⁵ Thus both the use of the particular noun “hardness” (σκληρότης) and its association with “heart” in Rom 2:5 point toward a conflation of

³⁵ The σκληρ-root as an adjectival form, whether as the compound σκληροκάρδιος or as an adjective modifying καρδία, also occurs in Prov 17:20; 28:14; Sir 3:26, 27; Ezek 3:7.

Deut 9:27; 10:16. As for the adjective ἀμετανόητος (“unrepentant”), Paul apparently equates failure to circumcise one’s hard-heart, in accordance with Deut 10:16, with an unrepentant heart, likely because the theme of repentance carries over from Rom 2:4. Crucial corroboration for this proposed conflation of Deut 9:27; 10:16 is found in Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305, an interpretation of Deut 10:16 that applies this verse to unruly persons, who, “on account of hardness [σκληρότητα] of ways, refuse the rein, leaping stubbornly and flailing their heads about.” As we shall see, besides his use of the term “hardness” (σκληρότης) from Deut 9:27, there are other reasons for interpreting Philo’s description of unruly persons as a reference, if not exclusively at least principally, to the Israelites who were led into Egyptian vanity through worship of the golden calf (cf. esp. *Mos.* 2.169).

Were Paul’s characterization of the interlocutor in Rom 2:5 the only indication that he had Deut 9–10 in mind, then it would prove suggestive, at best. Yet, as it turns out, Rom 2:6–11 reinforces the evocation. This Pauline text, especially in vv. 7–10, takes an elaborate chiasmic form. The emphasis on equitable judgment, or judgment according to works, in v. 6 is balanced by an emphasis on impartial judgment in v. 11. In between, vv. 7–10 mirror one another in two respects.³⁶ First, the order of punishment–reward in vv. 7–8 is reversed in vv. 9–10. Second, whereas both vv. 7–8 focus on what a person does and then the results of that action, whether reward or punishment, vv. 9–10 begin with the result before relating the associated action, whether that which leads to

³⁶ This insight comes from Paul J. Achtemeier, “Romans 3:1–8: Structure and Argument,” *ATHR Supplementary Series* 11 (1990): 77–87[83, n. 32].

punishment or reward. Accordingly, the chiasmic form of Rom 2:6–11 may be represented as follows:

- A** Equitable Judgment: “Who will repay each person according to his works” (v. 6)
- B** Reward: **Action:** “To those who by perseverance of good work seek glory and honor and incorruptibility” (v. 7a)
Result: “Eternal life” (v. 7b)
- C** Punishment: **Action:** “To those who from selfish ambition and disobedience to the truth but obedience to unrighteousness” (v. 8a)
Result: “Wrath and fury” (v. 8b)
- C'** Punishment: *Result:* “Affliction and distress” (v. 9a)
Action: “Upon every soul of a person who does evil” (v. 9b)
Jew and Greek: “Of the Jew first and of the Greek” (v. 9c)
- B'** Reward: *Result:* “Glory and honor and peace” (v. 10a)
Action: “To everyone who does good” (v. 10b)
Jew and Greek: “To the Jew first and to the Greek” (v. 10c)
- A'** Impartial Judgment: “For there is no partiality with God” (v. 11)

The elaborate chiasmic structure of these verses, not to mention the manner in which they are linked to v. 5 through a relative pronoun that refers to God, strongly suggests the continuation of Paul’s indictment of the Jewish interlocutor. Yet another indication in this regard is the stress upon punishment as well as reward for the Jew *first*, a point that stands out by virtue of the fact that, appearing only in the second half of the chiasm, it intrudes upon the parallelism with the first part.

Given that Rom 2:6–11 continues the indictment of the Jewish interlocutor that began at Rom 2:1 and is linked inferentially to an evocation of the golden calf incident

and given that Paul's characterization of this interlocutor in Rom 2:5 seems to conflate Deut 9:27; 10:16, a conflation also found in Philo, one ought to be at least attentive to other signs that Paul subsequently evokes Deut 9–10. There are, in fact, three further signs to this effect. First, although the specific term employed by Paul for “partiality” (προσωποληψία) in Rom 2:11 as well as its cognates occur only in the NT and early Christian literature,³⁷ the notion of divine impartiality, as noted, is found in Deut 10:17, a verse that scholars regularly cite in relation to Rom 2:11, even if few discern the connection with Paul's earlier characterization of the interlocutor in v. 5.³⁸

Second, the emphasis on equitable judgment in Rom 2:6, in chiastic parallel with the declaration of divine impartiality in Rom 2:11, even if influenced in wording by Ps 62(61):12(13) and Prov 24:12, may be regarded as an inference drawn from the juxtaposition of Gentile and Jewish sin in Deut 9–10. One finds just such an inference in Sir 16:9–14. As discussed in chapter five, this text shares with Rom 2:6–11 remarkable formal, intertextual, and conceptual similarities. Conceptually, for example, both passages emphasize impartial judgment, even if Sirach does so through a word-play (cf. Deut 9:6, 13; 10:17; Sir 16:11a), equitable judgment, and punishment as well as reward, all in the context of comparing Gentile and Jewish sin. Such similarities, however, should not be taken to suggest that Paul was alluding to or making use of Sir 16:9–14. Rather, they, along with the parallel conflation in Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305, are better understood

³⁷ Cf. Acts 10:34; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; Jas 2:1, 9; 1 Pet 1:17; *1 Clem.* 1:3; *Barn.* 4:12; *Pol. Phil.* 6:1. Cf. also Matt 22:16; Mark 12:14; Luke 20:21.

³⁸ An exception is Dunn (*Romans* 1–8, 89), who, regarding Romans, states: “The movement of thought from 2:5–11 is in effect Paul's elaboration of Deut 10:16–17.”

as indications of an interpretive tradition, one rooted in an application of Deut 9:27; 10:16, 17 to Gentile and Jewish sin, upon which all three texts were drawing.

The third sign, providing corroboration that Paul intends to evoke Deut 9–10 throughout Rom 2:5–11, is the numerous affinities between these two texts, especially when Paul’s developing argument is taken into account. These affinities will be discussed in detail in chapter five. For now, it should simply be noted that Deut 9–10 provides Paul with scriptural precedent for associating Gentiles and Jews, under the Law-covenant, with “impiety,” or “impious conduct” (ἀσέβεια, ἀσέβημα; cf. Deut 9:4, 5, 27; Rom 1:18), and a lack of “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη; cf. Deut 9:4, 5, 6; Rom 1:17–18; 3:20–21), thus preparing for Paul’s proclamation of justification by faith, beginning in Rom 3:21.

Finally, in the course of Paul’s indictment of the Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:1–11, one that begins with an inferential application of Ps 106(105) and transitions to an indirect application, by means of Deut 9–10, we may note yet another indication of the importance of Rom 1:23, the verse in which Ps 106(105) is first evoked. As we have seen above, Rom 2:7, 10 are parallel members of an elaborate chiasmic structure. In Rom 2:7, those who seek “glory” (δόξα), “honor” (τιμή), and “incorruptibility” (ἀφθαρσία) receive eternal life, whereas in Rom 2:10, “glory” and “honor” are not part of the goal but, along with “peace” (εἰρήνη), the reward for right conduct. Significantly, three of these four terms may be related to or found in Rom 1:23.

Beginning with “honor” (τιμή), although neither this term nor one of its cognates appear in Rom 1:23, the notion of dishonorable bodily treatment and desires (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι ... πάθη ἀτιμίας) is prominent in Rom 1:24, 26, perhaps implying a prior

forfeiture of honor in Rom 1:23. As for the other two terms, the change of Rom 1:23 involves the “glory” (δόξα) of the “incorruptible” (ἄφθαρτος) God for images of a “corruptible” (φθαρτός) human and animals. Thus, in the interest of indicting a Jewish interlocutor, salvation is essentially depicted in Rom 2:7, 10 as a pursuit and recovery of what was lost in Rom 1:23, with one of the key terms utilized in this depiction, “glory,” deriving in its initial appearance from Ps 106(105). This subtle depiction of salvation, then, yields concluding corroboration for the claim that constitutively as well as rhetorically, through ironic, inferential, and indirect application, the latter by means of Deut 9–10, Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11.

Sketching a Larger Context

If this thesis regarding Ps 106(105) as the substructure to Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11 is valid, then there must be a broader context in which these evocations of the golden calf may be placed, one that allows for a subtle but significant use of this psalm, whether directly, even if evocatively, or indirectly, by means of Deut 9–10. Ideally, this context would explain how the golden calf incident could have been such a sensitive and malleable subject that certain words from Ps 106(105):20 could trigger an ironic and, to a Jew, innocuous application of the incident, while an inferential application of *those same words*, in the midst of sudden opposition to a Jewish interlocutor, along with other words and associated concepts drawn from Deut 9–10 could then prove to be problematic for a Hellenistic Jewish sense of superiority in

relation to Gentile idolatry and immorality. Moreover, this context would also explain why Ps 106(105), in particular, would have been chosen to play a central role.

Although it is beyond the scope of my dissertation to attempt to reconstruct, in detail, a context matching this ideal description, chapter six will present a secondary sketch in which intriguing evidence for just such a context may be discerned. My intent in offering this sketch is not to make my thesis dependent on its validity or lack thereof. Quite the contrary. I offer this sketch as an illustration of the plausibility of my primary claim, that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11, argumentation in which evocations of the calf play a prominent role. With my intent now clear, we may proceed to a preview of the sketch. The components of this sketch include general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire, a particular conversation concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), and Paul's exploitation of both sides of that conversation.

General Confusion: Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire

The general confusion about the difference between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire is a consequence of three factors: shared customs of circumcision and food taboos (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.137–142; Philo, *Spec.* 1.2; *QG* 3.47; Herodotus 2.37–38, 104; Diodorus Siculus 1.28; 3.32); various ethnographic models tracing Jewish origins to Egypt (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.227–53, 288–92, 304–11; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2–3; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 31 [363c–d]; Diodorus Siculus 1.28, 55); and slanders about Jewish worship of a golden ass (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.79–120; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3–4; Plutarch,

Quaest. conv. 4.5 [670d–e]). All three of these factors combined to create confusion in the Roman world between Hellenistic Jews, who prided themselves on aniconic worship, and Egyptians, who were infamous for worshipping animals such as the Apis bull. It is this confusion and the Hellenistic Jewish desire to dispel such confusion (cf. esp. *Let. Aris.* 138, 144) that provide the backdrop against which the golden calf incident is seen to have been an especially sensitive, and thus easily evoked, subject. Indeed, Josephus entirely avoids the matter in his *Jewish Antiquities*, while Philo (*Mos.* 2.159–173, 270–274; *Spec.* 3.124–127) consistently presents an apologetic construal, associating the incident with the Levites' election to priesthood and attributing the worship of the calf to those led astray by Egyptian vanity. Such an approach, however, comes at the cost of conceding that the golden calf incident is a moment in Israel's history in which at least some among her behaved like Egyptian animal worshipers.

Particular Conversation: Differing Understandings of Jewish Identity in Wisdom of Solomon 11–19 and Psalms 105(104)–107(106)

As for the particular conversation in which Paul would have been one, among many, participants, that conversation may have been sparked by the understanding of Jewish identity reflected in Wis 11–19. As is well known, Wis 11–19 utilizes pentateuchal material from the plague accounts and wilderness wanderings to construct seven contrasts between God's provision/mercy for the Israelites and punishment of the Egyptians, making room for two excursuses along the way. The second excursus in Wis 13:1–15:19 is a critique of aberrant forms of worship, ranging from Greco-Roman deification of divine works (13:1–9) to Egyptian idolatry and theriolatry (15:14–19).

Following the central section in that excursus, which details the origin and punitive end of idolatry (14:9–31), the author pauses in Wis 15:1–6 to reflect on the LORD’s covenantal kindness to Israel. Although scholars frequently cite the beginning of this passage in relation to Rom 2:4, as I have done above (cf. p. 22), it has gone almost entirely unobserved, *when comparing these two texts*, that Wis 15:1–6 is itself an implicit interpretation of the golden calf incident as recounted in Exod 32–34.³⁹ Recalling the divine attributes revealed in the aftermath of the golden calf incident (cf. Exod 34:6–7; Wis 15:1), the interpretation regards Moses’ prayer in Exod 34:8–10 for the LORD to take away Israel’s “sin” (ἁμαρτία) and “lawlessness” (ἀνομία) so that “we will be to you” (ἐσόμεθα σοί) as having been answered. This explains the author of Wisdom’s confident declaration that “we will not sin,” which in context refers to idolatry, and then the subsequent denial of complicity in contemporary idolatry (Wis 15:2–6). Moreover, the construal of Jewish identity in Wis 15:1–6 reflects the author of Wisdom’s theological blueprint for interpreting the Pentateuch, a blueprint that acts as a filter by either mitigating or omitting the prominent motif of Israelite sin.

As it turns out, none other than Ps 105(104) both provides hermeneutical warrant for the approach to the Pentateuch taken in Wis 11–19 and may also be regarded as inspiring its seven contrasts between punishment of the Egyptians and provision/mercy for the Israelites. Not only does the symbolic number seven figure prominently in the

³⁹ Francis Watson (*Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* [London: T & T Clark International, 2004], 409, n. 84, 411), an apparent exception, recognizes that Wis 15:1 is rooted in Exod 34:5ff. but fails to see that Wis 15:1–2 is actually an interpretation of the golden incident, rather than merely an invocation of the attributes revealed in the aftermath of the golden calf incident. On Wis 15:1–2 as an interpretation of the golden calf incident, see Maurice Gilbert, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13–15)* (AnBib 53; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1973), 181–82.

portrayal of the plagues upon the Egyptians in Ps 105(104):23–38 but also comparison with the following presentation of God’s provision for Israel in vv. 39–41 allows one to reconstruct, from Ps 105(104), four of the first five contrasts in Wis 11–19. Thus, if Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Rom 1:18–2:11, then, in a manner of speaking, Ps 105(104) serves as the substructure for the traditions found in Wis 11–19. Wis 11–19 and Rom 1:18–2:11, in other words, are supported by what at first appear to be the very close, in terms of proximity, but very distant, in terms of emphases, Pss 105(104) and 106(105).

Further consideration of these psalms, however, leads to the recognition that they comprise two-thirds of a trilogy. Although Pss 105(104)–106(105) are separated from Ps 107(106) by the doxological formula that divides the Psalter into five books (cf. Pss 41[40]:13[14]; 72[71]:18–19; 89[88]:52[53]; 106[105]:48), these three psalms are nonetheless linked by a common opening, Ἀλληλουϊά. Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ ... (“*Hallelujah*. Praise the LORD ...”), and are structured according to the pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration, a pattern prominent in biblical and extra-biblical writings.⁴⁰

When one compares Pss 105(104)–107(106), viewed in light of this theological pattern, to Wis 11–19, two points are especially noteworthy. First, Wis 11–19, with its minimalist hermeneutic in relation to Israelite sin, lacks the element of Repentance provided by Ps 106(105), the necessary prelude to Restoration, as Ps 107(106):1–3 suggests. Second, Wis 11–19 and Ps 106(105) share five contrastive parallels. In each

⁴⁰ Cf. e.g. Lev 26; Deut 28, 30; Dan 9:4–19; 2 Macc 1:24–29; Tob 13:1–17; 14:3–7; Bar 1:15–3:8; *Jub.* 1.7–17; *Sib. Or.* 3.265–294; CD 1.1–11a; Philo, *Praem.* 79–172.

contrastive parallel, Wisdom omits entirely or mitigates the motif of Israelite rebellion found in the Pentateuch while Ps 106(105) focuses upon it.

My suggestion is that the numerous parallels between Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), some synonymous, others antithetical, would not have escaped the biblically-fluent Jewish communities among whom these texts circulated in the Second Temple period. If so, the differing portrayals of identity may have given rise to an intra-Jewish debate. On one side of the debate would have been apologetically-oriented Diaspora or Hellenistic Jews subscribing to the conception of identity in Wis 11–19 and others like it. In this understanding, it would have been important to differentiate Jews from idolatrous Gentiles and especially from theriolatrous Egyptians. It would also have been important not to encourage the various slanders and libels brought against Jews (cf. Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 28.66–69; Juvenal, *Satirae* 14.96–106; Tacitus, *Historiae* 5.4–5) by drawing attention to the often less than ideal portrayal in Israel’s own sacred writings. Such concerns are reflected in Wis 11–19. On the other side of the debate would have been other Jews subscribing to the conception of identity in Pss 105(104)–107(106) and the numerous other texts evincing the biblical pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration. In this understanding, it would have been important to acknowledge Jewish sin, including Gentile-like episodes of idolatry, in the hope that repentance would lead to restoration, understood by these Jews in the first-century as the end of Roman occupation of Palestine.

Pauline Exploitation: Re-Reading Romans 1:18–2:11

Postulating the presence of such an intra-Jewish debate provides a precedent for utilizing Ps 106(105) to oppose the Hellenistic Jewish conception of identity in Wis 11–19 and also explains how an author like Paul could employ subtle evocations of Ps 106(105) with the hope, if not expectation, that they would be recognized. Moreover, assuming the existence of this debate allows one to account for both the broad sweep and specific form taken by Paul's argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11, including the oft-noted similarities between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis 13–15, the malleable use of Ps 106(105), and the precise manner in which Paul suddenly opposes a Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:1–11. Presupposing, then, the existence of this intra-Jewish debate, or one close to it, Paul, it seems, tried to exploit both sides. Re-reading Rom 1:18–2:11 in chapter six will allow us to see, or at least speculate about, how Paul may have attempted to do this.

Plan: Preview of Chapters

Following the present introductory chapter, my dissertation is composed of six subsequent chapters. Chapter two, a review of literature, begins with a survey of the history of scholarship on each of the four pavement stones that I have identified, in the process preparing the way for the alignment for which I shall argue. The second section of chapter two then focuses on scholarly analyses, whether anticipatory or errant, related to my primary proposal that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Rom 1:18–2:11 and, in one instance, related to my secondary suggestion concerning a preexisting intra-Jewish dispute.

Chapter three concerns methodological issues, including the hermeneutical approach that I have adopted as well as the literary and linguistic atmosphere in which Paul's rhetorical bridge was constructed. Regarding the former, although the language of "substructure" derives from C. H. Dodd, the hermeneutical approach presupposed throughout this study comes from the combined influence of Richard B. Hays and Francis Watson, specifically their notions of metaleptic allusion and three-way, or complex, conversation. Since the viability of Hays's notion of metalepsis, in particular, has been the subject of dispute, I provide a critical, though appreciative, response to the objections of Christopher D. Stanley. Positively, consideration of Stanley's objections fosters a re-conceptualization of metalepsis in light of the ancient oral/aural environment of the first century. As for the literary and linguistic atmosphere, I argue that the interaction of Paul and his contemporaries with Greek texts of the Hebrew scriptures must be set within the broader context of limited textual fluidity, a context that has become especially evident in the post-Qumran era. Precisely because this fluidity is *limited*, however, we can be reasonably confident of an adequate match *in hermeneutically significant details* between our critically reconstructed texts and their ancient ancestors that would have been employed by Paul and others. An extended treatment of the LXX Psalms corroborates this claim.

Chapter four is devoted to a close reading of Ps 106(105). It shows that the golden calf incident, as recounted in vv. 19–23, is the central of seven Israelite sins outside the Land, one that both participates in and serves as a turning point for thematic progression related to the severity of Israel's sin and the LORD's corresponding reaction to that sin in

vv. 7–33. Once inside the Land, Israel’s immoral imitation of the Gentiles, expressed in an elaborate chiasm of key-words in vv. 34–40, enrages the LORD and leads him in vv. 41–42 to give her over to oppression by the Gentiles, an act that is punitive and preservative. The cyclical pattern of salvation and sin follows in vv. 43–46 before giving way to a concluding plea for restoration in v. 47, which makes explicit what was implicit in vv. 4–5, namely Israel’s exilic state. What emerges from this close reading is that vv. 20 and 41a, occur at key junctures of Ps 106(105). Thus their constitutive role in the structure of Rom 1:22–32 as well as rhetorical importance to the indictment of Rom 2:1–11 may be taken to suggest that Paul intends to evoke the whole psalm. Corroboration for this inference is found in the overall portrayal of Israel’s Gentile-like behavior in Ps 106(105), including idolatry and sexual immorality. This portrayal, in turn, provides hermeneutical support for Paul’s charges against an unidentified Jewish interlocutor, beginning in Rom 2:1.

Chapter five consists of an extended treatment of Rom 1:18–2:11, one that approaches the text from three vantage points. The first is structural analysis. The structural analysis shows that the *a–ba–ba–b* “(ex)change”/“giving-over” pattern of vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, and 28–32 highlights the importance of the foundational idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23 such that when the unidentified interlocutor of Rom 2:1 ff. is charged with doing or practicing “the same things” and “such things,” he is being indicted for actions that have their origin in idolatry. Moreover, the intricate chiastic structure of Rom 2:6–11 participates in the continued indictment of the interlocutor, hints at his Jewish identity, and draws attention to seeking as well as receiving qualities that

seem to have been lost in the initial idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23. The second vantage point is substructural analysis. This section of chapter five explores the conflated evocation of Ps 106(105):20 and Gen 1:20–27 in Rom 1:23, the use of Ps 106(105):41a in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28, and the indirect employment of Ps 106(105):23 in Rom 2:5–11, by way of allusions to Deut 9–10. The third vantage point is surface analysis. This final section of chapter five reads Rom 1:18–2:11 in light of the preceding structural and substructural analyses, showing how they lead to a coherent and even compelling interpretation of the text, one that draws attention to the ironic, inferential, and indirect applications Ps 106(105).

Chapter six, in turn, sketches a larger context in which these ironic, inferential, and indirect applications of Ps 106(105), which are especially related to the golden calf incident, make sense. As noted above, the components of this sketch include general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire, a particular conversation concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), and Paul’s exploitation of both sides of that conversation. Finally, chapter seven briefly summarizes my argument and notes some avenues for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In chapter one, I identified four interlocking pavement stones (a problematic particle, an uncertain similarity, an unidentified interlocutor, and a possible dialogue partner) which constitute the rhetorical bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11. Proper alignment of these pavement stones, I proposed, leads to the recognition that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11 and may also point to a particular conversation about Jewish identity, one involving Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106).¹ This chapter is devoted to a consideration of these four

¹ Proper alignment of these four pavement stones does not, however, resolve all of the questions arising from Rom 1:18–2:11, especially when the textual context extending to 3:20 is taken into account. For example, one may raise questions about how Paul’s portrayal of “do-gooders” who obtain “eternal life” (2:7, 10) and his subsequent statement that οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (2:14) coheres with his doctrine of justification by faith. See the discussion in Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 139–42. Although Moo concludes in light of Rom 3:9, 19–20 that “consistent, earnest seeking after good ... can never be realized” (p. 142), Simon J. Gathercole (“A Law Unto Themselves: The Gentiles in Romans 2.14–15 Revisited,” *JSNT* 85 [2002]: 27–49) argues convincingly that Gentile law-fulfilling Christians are being juxtaposed with unbelieving law-breaking Jews in Rom 2:14–15 and again in 2:25–29. The supposed conflict between affirming non-hypothetical Torah-observant Gentile Christians as those whom Paul has in mind in Rom 2:14–15 and 2:25–29 and the declaration in Rom 3:20 διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ is easily resolved in light of Paul’s πνεῦμα-σὰρξ antithesis. In other words, in Rom 3:20 Paul is not affirming the impossibility of any *person* but the impossibility of any *flesh* (i.e. without the Spirit’s empowering presence) being justified by works of Torah (cf. Rom 8:3–4; 13:8–10; Gal 5:13–26). Especially in view of Eph 2:8–10, this doctrine of justification of Torah observers in Paul need not be taken to conflict with his doctrine of justification by faith; that is, the works may be construed as evidence of salvation by grace through faith and as having their origin in God. See further Simon J. Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 223–24; Akio Ito, “Romans 2: A Deuteronomistic Reading,” *JSNT* 59 (1995): 21–37[29–30]; Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 265–66; John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: Paul’s Ethics in Galatians* (Vancouver: Regent College, 1988), 106–45, 178–215.

pavement stones in the history of scholarship and to analyses, whether anticipatory or errant, related to my primary proposal that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Rom 1:18–2:11. The body of this chapter is composed of two sections. The first reviews the treatment of each pavement stone and in the process illustrates their interlocking nature as well as advocates for the alignment of each stone that I shall explicate more fully in chapters five and six. The second section, in turn, consists of two subsections. Subsection one focuses on pre-critical and critical analyses that anticipate the substructural role I propose for Ps 106(105). Subsection two subsection concludes with three analyses that err in drawing attention away from Ps 106(105), thus underscoring the need for the renewed scholarly focus upon the relevance of Ps 106(105) to Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11. We turn now to an extensive discussion of the four pavement stones.

Four Pavement Stones

Problematic Particle: Διό

The first and perhaps most conspicuous pavement stone is the problematic particle διό of Rom 2:1. As recently as 2006, Bo Frid stated: “The issue of διό and its part in connecting 2.1 to the previous portion 1.18–32 has been—and still is—a battlefield.”² Only a few years before Frid, Runar M. Thorsteinsson devoted eleven pages to what he called “The Διό Debate.”³ The key to understanding this debate begins with the

² Bo Frid, “How Does Romans 2.1 Connect to 1.18–32?” *SEA* 71 (2006): 109–30[122].

³ Runar M. Thorsteinsson, *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography* (ConBNT 40; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003), 177–88. Jouette M. Bassler (*Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* [SBLDS 59; Chico: Scholars, 1982], 255, n. 43) refers to the διό of Rom 2:1 as “something of a *crux interpretum* for exegetes, especially under the prevailing presupposition of a major break in thought between these two chapters.”

etymology and meaning of the term. As a “Conj., for δι’ ὅ,”⁴ διό typically functions inferentially. The reason many scholars have had difficulty with its inferential force here is because, as N. T. Wright puts it, “The ‘therefore’ [διό] at the start is puzzling, since the person addressed is *ex hypothesi* not guilty of the charge at the end of 1:32.”⁵

Apparently C. K. Barrett found this particle so puzzling that he changed his mind about its function. In the 1957 edition of his commentary Barrett regards “i. 32 b as a parenthesis” and connects διό with 1:32a as follows: “Men know God’s verdict on such sinners as are described in 1. 29ff.”⁶ In the 1991 edition, however, this interpretation of 1:32b as a parenthesis is relegated to the status of a possible solution but one less likely than the view that διό refers to 1:18–32. Barrett then speculates that “the connection of thought could be: all men have rejected the knowledge of God (and show the fact by their behaviour), refusing him the glory and gratitude that are his due (i. 21), all *therefore* are under his judgement; and this includes those whose rejection of God is more subtle than that of the murderer, thief, or adulterer.”⁷ Barrett’s hesitancy reflected in the expression “could be,” even after his change of mind, illustrates the difficulty scholars have had with the διό of Rom 2:1 and calls for caution as we proceed. A survey of the literature reveals

⁴ Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed. with supplements added; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 432.

⁵ N. T. Wright, “The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 10 (ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 395–770[432]. See also Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 106.

⁶ *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row), 43.

⁷ *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2d ed.; BNTC; London: A & C Black), 42, italics in original.

that there are essentially three positions in this debate: (1) Excising διό; (2) Eliminating the inferential sense of διό; and (3) Embracing the inferential sense of διό.

Excising Διό

Representatives of the first position, excising διό, include Rudolf Bultmann⁸ and Anton Fridrichsen.⁹ Bultmann begins his discussion by noting what every exegete supposedly knows: The difficulty caused by διό since v. 1 cannot represent a conclusion from the preceding.¹⁰ This difficulty serves as the basis for Bultmann's proposal that v. 1 was originally a marginal gloss which drew an inference from v. 3.¹¹ Apparently, this gloss was not only improperly incorporated into the text but also in the wrong place. Hence the scholarly confusion.¹² The problem with Bultmann's proposal is twofold. First,

⁸ "Glossen im Römerbrief," *TLZ* 72 (1947): 197–202; reprinted in Rudolf Bultmann, *Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments* (ed. Erich Dinkler; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1967), 278–84. Quotations are from the latter.

⁹ "Quatre conjectures sur le texte du Nouveau Testament," *RHPR* 3 (1923): 439–42[440]. See also idem, "Der Wahre Jude und sein Lob: Röm. 2,28f," *SO* 1 (1922): 39–49[40]. Note that this 1922 article is missing from the following bibliography of Fridrichsen's writings: Erik Heen, *Anton Fridrichsen (1888–1953): A Bibliography* (University of Oslo. Faculty of Theology Bibliography Series 5; Oslo: University of Oslo, Faculty of Theology, 1993), 85–88.

¹⁰ In the words of Bultmann (*Exegetica*, 281): "Jeder Exeget weiß, welche Schwierigkeit das διό macht, mit dem der Vers beginnt, der doch wirklich keine Folgerung aus dem Vorausgehenden sein kann."

¹¹ Note the similarities between vv. 1 and 3:

v. 1: ὁ ἄνθρωπος ... ὁ κρίνων	=	v. 3: ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κρίνων
v. 1: αὐτὰ πράσσεις	=	v. 3: πράσσοντας ... αὐτά

¹² Bultmann, *Exegetica*, 281. This proposal has garnered the sympathy of Franz J. Leenhardt (*The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary* [trans. Harold Knight; Cleveland: World Publishing, 1961], 74, n. †) and been followed by Ernst Käsemann (*Commentary on Romans* [trans. Geoffrey Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980], 54).

as Ulrich Wilckens observes, v. 3 seems to presuppose v. 1, not the reverse.¹³ Second, this proposal lacks any manuscript evidence to commend it.¹⁴

This last problem also affects Fridrichsen's proposal. Like Bultmann, he commences with the declaration that "One searches in vain for a logical relation between 2:1 and the preceding verses."¹⁵ Noting that from the point of view of paleography the difference between ΔΙΟ and ΔΙC ("twice") is insignificant, Fridrichsen suggests that an original δῖς was at some early point inadvertently changed to δῖό and consequently attempts to read the text as follows: "Twice more inexcusable are you, you who judge."¹⁶ Since this reading is without any manuscript support, understandably no scholar, of whom I am aware, follows Fridrichsen. Rather his willingness, as well as that of Bultmann, to engage in conjectural emendation underscores just how problematic is the δῖό of Rom 2:1.¹⁷

¹³ "Doch setzt V 3 V 1 voraus und muß daher im paulinischen Text belassen werden," Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT 6.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1978), 123; so also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 299; Richard H. Bell, *No One Seeks for God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 1.18–3.20* (WUNT 106; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 138–39, n. 30. The observation that v. 3 presupposes v. 1 appears to have changed the mind of Walter Schmithals. In his 1975 monograph he is sympathetic to Bultmann's proposal (*Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem* [SNT 9; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn], 13, n. 13, 204) but in his 1988 commentary he rejects the proposal because of this consideration (*Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar* [Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn], 84–85).

¹⁴ So also e.g. Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (trans. Scott J. Hafemann; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 39.

¹⁵ "On cherche en vain une relation logique entre 2, 1 et les versets précédents," Fridrichsen, "Quatre conjectures sur le texte du Nouveau Testament," 440.

¹⁶ "Deux fois plus inexcusable es-tu, toi qui te fais juge," Fridrichsen, "Quatre conjectures sur le texte du Nouveau Testament," 440. Fridrichsen then provides this commentary on his emendation: "Ces personnages qui jugent autrui en se livrant aux mêmes péchés que lui, encourrent une responsabilité plus grande, et leur vice est aggravé par de l'hypocrisie."

¹⁷ Admittedly, Bultmann (*Exegetica*, 278–84) engages in several other instances of conjectural emendation as well for the text of Romans.

Eliminating Inferential Sense of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$

Advocates of the second position, eliminating the inferential sense of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$, include Hans Lietzmann and Brendan Byrne. We begin with Lietzmann. Although the first 1906 edition of his commentary does not mention $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$, the subsequent editions include a discussion of this problematic particle.¹⁸ The stance Lietzmann ultimately comes to in the fourth 1933 edition is that the $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ of 2:1 must be regarded as a “farbloße Uebergangspartikel” (“colorless transition particle”), lacking any inferential sense.¹⁹ The 1931 study of Einar Molland, which explores other “non-logical” uses of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$, is cited in support of this view.²⁰ What is important about Lietzmann’s discussion is his recognition that $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ is problematic only if Rom 1:18–32 (in his view Rom 1:20–32) is regarded as directed toward Gentiles and Rom 2:1–11 toward Jews. Since Lietzmann holds this position, in part because of the parallels with Wisdom, he has no choice but to eliminate the inferential sense of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$.

¹⁸ Cf. Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (1 ed.; HNT 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906), 12; idem, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer* (2d ed.; HNT 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919), 36; idem, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer* (3d ed.; HNT 8; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928), 39.

¹⁹ Hans Lietzmann, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer* (4th ed.; HNT 8; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933), 37–39. Note that there is a fifth 1971 edition of Lietzmann’s (*Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer* [5th ed.; HNT 8; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1971]) commentary. Since Lietzmann died in 1942, however, it is unchanged from the fourth 1933 edition. Although I will not again refer to the 1971 edition, it may be utilized to check references to the 1933 edition. Lietzmann’s view of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ is followed by Joseph Huby, *Épître aux Romains: Traduction et Commentaire* (new ed.; rev. P. Stanislas Lyonnet; *VS* 10; Paris: Beauchesne, 1957), 108–9, n. 2; Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (14th ed.; KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 73; Paul Althaus, *Der Brief an die Römer* (NTD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 22; Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (HTKNT 6; Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 68, “mit ... einem abgeschliffenen $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$.”

²⁰ Einar Molland, “ $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$, einige syntaktische Beobachtungen,” in *Serta Rudbergiana* (ed. Hans Holst and Henning Mørland; Oslo: A. W. Brøgger, 1931), 43–52.

If the elimination of Lietzmann is explicit, that of Byrne is implicit. While he notes that “The Greek conjunction *dio* normally draws an inference from what has gone before,” he nevertheless suggests that, in this instance, “the true inference would seem to go in the opposite direction.”²¹ In Byrne’s view, there are three classes of people to consider in relation to the transition between Rom 1:32 and 2:1. These are: (1) “practitioners” of vice; (2) “approvers” of vice; and (3) “disapprovers” of both the “practitioners” and “approvers.” According to Byrne, whereas the current flow of thought is from the “approvers” of vice in Rom 1:32b to the “disapprovers” in Rom 2:1, 3, it would make more sense to move in the opposite direction. In other words, if even those who disapprove of vice are inexcusable, then surely those who approve would be as well.

In order to clarify the logic inherent in Paul’s thought here, Byrne turns to Paul’s confrontation of Cephas (Peter) in Gal 2:11ff. Byrne suggests a “Solution to Plight”²² movement of thought is operative. In his own words:

The statement: “We are Jews by nature and not Gentile sinners” (v 15) could well sum up the complacent judgment expected of a Jewish reader at the end of Romans 1. “But,” continues Paul (v 16), “knowing (that is, having realized) that a person is not justified by works of law but through faith in Jesus Christ, we too put our faith in Christ, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not from works of law, because ‘from works of law shall no human being be justified’” (cf. Rom 3:20). Moreover (v 17), if this mode of justification implies—as it does—that “we too were found to be sinners,” that does not mean that Christ is a “minister of sin”—an objection which apparently has to be rebutted. The brief sequence in Gal 2:15-17 reveals the same logic whereby Jewish complacency with respect to righteousness is eroded on the grounds that what God has done through Jesus Christ implies a lack of righteousness on the part of Jews matching that of the Gentile world they judge; Jews along with Gentiles are locked in a

²¹ Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP 6; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996), 83.

²² Cf. E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Pattern of Religions* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 442–47, 474–511.

common bind of sin. But this is only the negative presupposition for the overwhelming good news of the triumphant common rescue through grace (Rom 3:21-26; Gal 2:16, 21).²³

Byrne's analysis is questionable. Arguably, there are not three classes of persons to consider in the transition between Rom 1:32 and 2:1 but only two. There are those who "practice" vice and *also* "approve" of others who do (Rom 1:32).²⁴ This group is then contrasted with those who "disapprove" of others who "practice" vice and yet themselves do the same (Rom 2:1, 3). With this understanding of the text, the flow of thought is perfectly intelligible. If those who practice and approve of vice are inexcusable then so too are those who disapprove and yet do the same; indeed, their disapproval is a sign of their own condemnation. The logical force of the inference depends on the basis for Paul's charge that his interlocutor does the "same," while disapproving of others. If that basis is sound, then the inference is unproblematic. This is a point to which I shall return.

The implicit denial of the inferential sense of $\delta\iota\acute{o}$ emerges from a consideration of the parallel with Gal 2:11 ff. The statement, "We are Jews by nature and not Gentile sinners" (Gal 2:15), which Byrne regards as indicative of "the complacent judgment expected of a Jewish reader at the end of Romans 1," does not necessarily imply anything about Jewish sinfulness. To arrive at this conclusion, one must specify further that the

²³ Byrne, *Romans*, 84.

²⁴ Similarly N. T. Wright ("Letter to the Romans," 434): "Nevertheless, they not only do these things but also applaud (NRSV) those who practice them. It is one thing to live a self-destructive life-style, recognizing it for what it is, grieving over it, and urging others to avoid it if they can. It is another, more sinister, thing to call evil good and good evil." See also Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico: Scholar's Press, 1981), 111. This recognition that Rom 1:32 concerns only one group of persons, not two, removes the implication that Paul regarded approval of vice as worse than practice, an implication that, in the words of C. E. B. Cranfield (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [ICC; London: T & T Clark, 1975], 133), has "perplexed readers from early times" and "caused a very considerable disturbance in the textual tradition."

“we” in question are Jews who have put their faith in Christ rather than in works of the Law and that there are consequences for this decision in regard to Jew-Gentile relations. This is precisely what Paul begins to do in Gal 2:16. The verse, however, commences with a textually uncertain $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. This term may be taken adversatively as “but” (Byrne’s view) or consecutively as “and,”²⁵ or it may be excised;²⁶ but $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ may not be read inferentially. To draw a parallel with Rom 2:1, as Byrne does, suggests that the $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ likewise lacks inferential sense. In the end, then, his reading is essentially the same as that of Lietzmann.²⁷ While this view is possible, I shall provide reason to question it in the structural analysis section of chapter five.

Embracing Inferential Sense of $\Delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$

Scholars who embrace the inferential sense of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ may be divided into different camps depending on how they identify the interlocutor, in puzzle piece three. For those, who regard the interlocutor as a Gentile or generic judge (whether Jew or Gentile), embracing the inferential sense of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ is relatively unproblematic. The assumption is simply that the interlocutor shares in the sorry state of human depravity depicted in Rom 1:18–32 and compounds this fact by his hypocritical judgment. As Adolf Schlatter observed in 1935, “the *dio* ... is perceived to be awkward only if the tight correlation of

²⁵ So e.g. Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Thomas Nelson: Nashville, 1990), 83.

²⁶ So e.g. James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993), 131, n. 2.

²⁷ With Byrne could be included the position of Stuhlmacher (*Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 40), who says that Rom 2:1 begins with a surprising “inferential ‘therefore,’” but later states that the basis for Paul’s claim that the interlocutor does the same is reserved until 2:17ff. Wright’s (“Letter to the Romans,” 438–39) remarks on $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron$ could also justify his placement in this category, even if elsewhere he recognizes the importance of Rom 1:23 (cf. comments on pp. 433, 438).

the statements [between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1ff.] is severed via the headings of ‘the Gentile—the Jew.’”²⁸ In fact, scholars who regard the interlocutor as a Gentile or generic judge sometimes do not even mention *δῖο*, or implicitly assign it an inferential sense without further discussion.²⁹ Apparently, for them the particle poses no problem at all.

For the majority of scholars who identify the interlocutor as a Jew, matters are quite different. They are faced with the difficulty of finding an inferential basis for indicting a Jewish dialogue partner from what appears to be an excoriation of Gentile idolatry and immorality.³⁰ As noted in chapter one, some (e.g. Bassler) conclude that Paul

²⁸ Adolf Schlatter, *Romans: The Righteousness of God* (trans. Siegfried Schatzmann; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 48; the German original, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Stuttgart: Calwer), was published in 1935. See also the discussion of Anders Nygren (*Commentary on Romans* [trans. Carl Rasmussen; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1949], 116–17) who, though he identifies the interlocutor as a Jew, regards the *δῖο* as unproblematic because of the parallels with Wisdom.

²⁹ The following scholars identify the interlocutor as a Gentile and implicitly assign the *δῖο* an inferential sense without further discussion: Luke Timothy Johnson, *Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Reading the New Testament; New York: Crossroad, 1997), 35 (specifically, he identifies the interlocutor as a “Hellenistic moral teacher”); Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 150; Leander E. Keck, *Romans* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2005), 75.

These scholars identify the interlocutor as a generic judge and do not even mention *δῖο*: Timo Laato, *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach* (trans. T. McElwain; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 115; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 86–91; Mark A. Seifrid, “Unrighteous by Faith: Apostolic Proclamation in Romans 1:18–3:20,” in *The Paradoxes of Paul* (ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid; vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 105–45[120–26].

Admittedly, there are instances of scholars who identify the interlocutor as a Jew but either do not mention or do not discuss *δῖο*. These include: C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (MNTC 6; London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1932), 31; Günther Bornkamm, *Early Christian Experience* (trans. Paul L. Hammer; New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 47–70; Andrew T. Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification: Tradition, Gospel, and Audience in the Theology of Romans 1:18–4:25,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers* (ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr.; SBLSP 32; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 194–226; Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 404–11; idem, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 192–216. Since only one of these works is a commentary, it may be that the other scholars do not feel the need to discuss every issue in their interpretation. At the very least, their failure to mention *δῖο* suggests that they do not regard the term as a significant problem.

³⁰ As Moo (*Epistle to the Romans*, 129) puts it, “The ‘therefore’ that connects the opening of Rom. 2 with Rom. 1 creates a problem for our conclusion that 1:18–32 is directed mainly against Gentiles and 2:1–16 mainly against Jews. For if Paul has shifted targets in this manner, we would expect the transition to

must have covertly intended Rom 1:18–32 to be directed toward Jews all along. Often the allusion to Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23 plays a role in this reading, even if it is not immediately connected to διό. As for this term, there are, in general, two bases to which these scholars point in trying to determine its inferential function. First, motivated by the twofold occurrence of ἀναπολόγητος (“without excuse”; 1:20; 2:1), the subtle but significant πᾶς (“all”; 1:18), and the depiction of general revelation (1:19–20), certain scholars look to some or all of Rom 1:18–20.³¹ Second, other scholars direct their attention to Rom 1:18–32 as a whole so as to include the depiction of moral degradation.³² What is striking about both groups, however, is the failure to connect one’s interpretation of διό to the charge that the interlocutor is guilty of τὰ αὐτά (“the same things”) and τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”). This point deserves further emphasis.

Connecting Διό to τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα

As just noted, scholars frequently fail to connect their discussion of διό to the charge that the interlocutor is guilty of τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα. In other words, pavement stones one and two are not brought into dialogue with one another. Thomas R. Schreiner may be cited as representative of this trend. Schreiner states: “Διό ... draws an inference from 1:18–32, but the rest of 2:1 helps understand precisely why this inference is drawn”; and he then cites Byrne in support of this last claim (cf. the discussion beginning on p. 53

be made with something like ‘in the same manner also.’ But how can the sin and guilt of Gentiles establish the conclusion (‘therefore’) that Jews who judge them are also ‘without excuse’?”

³¹ James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1988), 79; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 298–99; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 129–30.

³² Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.140–42; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.123; Schreiner, *Romans*, 106; Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting?* 204–5.

below).³³ What is lacking is any explicit mention of τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα. When it comes to interpreting these terms, Schreiner says that “the vices of 1:29–31 are probably in view.”³⁴ The διό, in other words, looks to Rom 1:18–32 as whole but τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα specifically to 1:29–31.

What I would like to suggest is that one cannot really engage in interpretive commentary about the inferential basis for διό in abstraction from τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα. The particle διό is either inferential or it is not. If it is inferential, it has no power, of its own accord, to point to anything in particular. Rather, that to which it points must be discerned from the rest of the sentence. A simple thought experiment will make this clear. Suppose Rom 2:1 said, Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, πράσσεις γὰρ τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα (“Therefore, you are without excuse, O human, for you do improper things”). If this was how Rom 2:1 began, then there would be no debate about the inferential function of διό or the nature of the inference at work. Scholars would note that because the persons described in the preceding are without excuse for improper actions (Rom 1:28), so too is this interlocutor for his own improper actions. One could go on to debate the cogency of this charge, but its logic would be clear. Why then do scholars not reason similarly in relation to the charge that the interlocutor “does” (ποιέω, πράσσω) the “same things” (τὰ αὐτά, τὰ τοιαῦτα) in Rom 2:1–3, clearly creating a link to Rom 1:28, 32 (ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα ... τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ... αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ... τοῖς πράσσουσιν)? The answer to this question leads me to pavement stone two.

³³ Schreiner, *Romans*, 106.

³⁴ Schreiner, *Romans*, 108.

Uncertain Similarity: τὰ αὐτὰ and τὰ τοιαῦτα

The second pavement stone is an uncertain similarity between the interlocutor's actions and the actions of those depicted in Rom 1:18–32. Specifically, to what do τὰ ... αὐτὰ (“the same things”) and the associated τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) in Rom 2:1, 2, 3 refer? This is the most neglected pavement stone. The issue, for example, receives scant attention in Ernst Käsemann's commentary. While this is understandable for v. 1, since Käsemann joins Bultmann in regarding it as a gloss, it is more difficult to justify in relation to vv. 2, 3. All Käsemann says about the matter in these verses is “τὰ τοιαῦτα overlaps a ταῦτα [*sic*] and is repeated in v. 3, meaning ‘all such.’”³⁵ As for scholars who do attend to the matter, some simply state that the interlocutor is guilty of the “same” or “very same” and leave it at that;³⁶ others, however, attempt to identify a particular referent, whether retrospective (1:18–32; 1:28–32),³⁷ prospective (2:17–24; 14:1 ff.),³⁸ or some combination of the two (1:18, 22–31; 2:7, 8).³⁹

³⁵ Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 55. The matter receives similar inattention in Bornkamm, *Early Christian Experience*, 59.

³⁶ William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (5th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902), 53; Schlatter, *Romans*, 48; Nygren, *Romans*, 120; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.139; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.123; Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification,” 205; Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 110.

³⁷ For 1:18–32, see Thorsteinsson, *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 188. For 1:28–32, esp. 1:29–31, see: Stanley K. Stowers, “Text as Interpretation: Paul and Ancient Readings of Paul,” in *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism* (ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs; New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism 3; Lanham: University Press of America, 1987), 17–27[21]; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 80, 90; Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism* (JSNTSup 45; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 120–21; Laato, *Paul and Judaism*, 90–91; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 131; Schreiner, *Romans*, 107–8.

³⁸ For 2:17–24, esp. 2:21–22, see: Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, 40; Byrne, *Romans*, 80–81; Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting?* 211–12; idem, “Justified by Faith, Justified by His Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21–4:25,” in *The Paradoxes of Paul* (ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid; vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic,

What is interesting is to compare how scholars who identify the interlocutor as a Jew treat τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα with those who regard him as a Gentile. Whether explicitly acknowledged or not, Byrne speaks for many in the former group when he says, “If, as seems to be the case, Paul already has Jews in mind [beginning in Rom 2:1], the accusation that they ‘do the same things’ creates a problem.”⁴⁰ What is the problem? It is that “Evidence from the ancient world suggests that adherence to the law kept Jews free from idolatry and the excesses, especially in the sexual area, attributed to Gentiles in 1:26-27.”⁴¹ Byrne then considers the possibility that Paul had in mind the vices of Rom 1:29–31 but rejects this as too literal an interpretation; he opts instead to regard the accusation as “generalized and anticipatory,” with “more specific charges” to follow in Rom 2:17–24.⁴² In fact, among the scholars I have surveyed, every single one who shares this view also identifies the interlocutor as a Jew (cf. n. 38 above). Why the reluctance among these scholars to connect the alternation between ποιέω (“do”) and πράσσω (“practice”) in relation to τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα in Rom 1:28, 32 to 2:1–3, especially

2004), 147–84[149–50, n. 10]; Wright, “Letter to the Romans,” 438–39, assuming the phrase “in a way yet to be explored” refers to 2:17ff. For 14:1ff., Robert Jewett (*Romans*, 197–98) states: “Many suggestions have been made concerning what these sins might have been, but Paul’s rhetorical purpose requires that no precise definition be given at this point. He comes back to this matter in chap. 14”

³⁹ Calvin L. Porter, “Romans 1.18–32: Its Role in the Developing Argument,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 210–28[224]. Cf. p. 218, Porter identifies “The Division” section of the discourse as Rom 1:22–31.

⁴⁰ Byrne, *Romans*, 81.

⁴¹ Byrne, *Romans*, 81. Similar statements about the relative moral purity of the Jews are found in: Frédéric Louis Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans* (rev. ed.; trans. A. Cusin; ed. Talbot W. Chambers; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), 114; Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, 43–44 [1957 version]; idem, *Epistle to the Romans*, 42 [1991 version]; Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 80; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 299; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 130; Schreiner, *Romans*, 107, n. 3.

⁴² Byrne, *Romans*, 81.

when the latter text begins with a term, *διό*, which typically functions inferentially? My suggestion is that these scholars, like Byrne, are reluctant to associate a Jewish interlocutor with actions that have their origin in idolatry.⁴³ This is not true of all scholars who identify the interlocutor as a Jew. Bassler and Watson, in particular, are notable exceptions and their views will be explored more fully below. Nevertheless, it is true of many, including those who mitigate the charge of doing *τὰ αὐτά* and *τὰ τοιαῦτα*⁴⁴ and those who relate these terms to the vices of Rom 1:29–31 without then connecting them to the “sin-retribution” sequence of Rom 1:22–32.⁴⁵

Scholars who identify the interlocutor as a Gentile, however, show much less reluctance to associate *τὰ αὐτά* and *τὰ τοιαῦτα* with idolatry. Thorsteinsson, for example, says the charge that the interlocutor does the “same things” suggests that “he himself is one of those spoken of in 1:18–32,” which implies that he, like them, is guilty of idolatry.⁴⁶ As noted in chapter one, Philip F. Esler goes even further. He identifies the

⁴³ Gathercole (*Where Is Boasting?* 204–5, 211–12, material in brackets mine), it should be noted, does at least consider the possibility that in Rom 2:1–3, “Paul makes reference to Jewish sin in 1:18–32 by reference to the sin of the golden calf [i.e. the allusion to Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23] and also to the sins of attitude in [vv.] 29–31.” He rejects this possibility, however, for the “marginally better alternative” that the interlocutor is guilty of wicked deeds which are eventually articulated in Rom 2:21ff.

⁴⁴ E.g. Cranfield (*Epistle to the Romans*, 1.142) states: “*τὰ ... αὐτά* need not imply that the judge sins in precisely the same ways.”

⁴⁵ See Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 131. Cf. p. 117.

⁴⁶ Thorsteinsson, *Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans* 2, 188. See also Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 103–4. Johnson (*Reading Romans*, 35–36), having noted that Paul’s warning is connected to the attack on idolatry in Rom 1:18–32, then follows C. K. Barret (*Epistle to the Romans*, 44 [1957 edition]; *Epistle to the Romans*, 42 [1991 edition]) in interpreting the interlocutor’s judgmentalism as an idolatrous usurpation of God’s role (cf. Rom 14).

interlocutor as a Gentile precisely because the charge of doing τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα

implicates him in idolatry. Esler states:

The person referred to in 2:1-6 engages in the same practices, which can only mean idolatry (1:19-23) and the vices listed (1:26-31), while hypocritically passing judgment on others who do the same. It is implausible to imagine that a first-century CE Judean like Paul (and cf. 9:1-5 and 11:1), someone who prided himself on belonging to a people separate from sinful non-Judeans (Gal 2:15), would ever blur the fundamental distinction that separated his ethnic group from the disliked outgroups by attributing idolatry to Judeans.⁴⁷

So clear are the idolatrous implications and accompanying Gentile identity of the interlocutor for Esler that the reasons for the “fierce debate as to whom Paul is addressing” in Rom 2:1 ff. escape him.

Before recounting these reasons in the next section, it is worth observing that those who identify the interlocutor as a Jew, and are therefore reluctant to associate τὰ αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα with idolatry, and those who identify him as a Gentile, and show no such reluctance, share the same assumption. It is that Rom 1:18–32 is exclusively an *empirical* depiction of theriolatrous idolatry and consequent immorality. As noted in chapter one, I shall suggest that it is better understood as a *hermeneutical* depiction built upon the substructure of Ps 106(105). Not only does Rom 1:23 draw upon the account of the golden calf in Ps 106(105):20 but also the structurally significant παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in Rom 1:24, 25, 28 is likely inspired by παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ κύριος] (“the LORD gave them over”) in Ps 106(105):41a, since in both cases idolatry and immorality serve as the occasion for the handing-over (cf. Rom 1:22–32; Ps 106[105]:34–41). Indeed, viewed through the metaleptic lens of Ps 106(105), the

⁴⁷ Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, 151.

potential implication in Rom 2:1 ff. that a Jewish interlocutor is guilty of “the same things,” including idolatry, takes on rhetorical force.

Unidentified Interlocutor: Gentile, Generic Judge, or Jew

The third pavement stone is an unidentified interlocutor. When Paul says, ὁ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων (“O human, every person who judges”) whom does he have in mind? A survey of scholarly opinion on this matter reveals conflicting claims, shared analogies, and varying views moving in the opposite direction. With regard to conflicting claims, consider the following: for Gunther Bornkamm, “It should not be contested that in 2.1 ff. the Apostle, in fact, has the Jews especially in mind”; for Neil Elliot the “very general” characterization of the interlocutor means “No more precise identification (i.e., as Jew, Gentile, etc.) is possible, nor ... is such restrictive precision intended”; finally, for Leander E. Keck, “2:1 clearly continues the indictment of Gentiles in 1:18-32.”⁴⁸ As for shared analogies, it is not uncommon to find scholars who, having identified the interlocutor as a Jew, then compare Paul’s rhetorical turn to Nathan’s indictment of David (cf. 2 Sam 12);⁴⁹ yet Stanley K. Stowers also employs this analogy even though in his 1994 *A Rereading of Romans* he identifies the interlocutor as a Gentile.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ See respectively: Bornkamm, *Early Christian Experience*, 69, n. 54; Elliott, *Rhetoric of Romans*, 125; Keck, *Romans*, 74. More tentative is Leenhardt (*Epistle to the Romans*, 73), who states, “It is not easy to decide to whom Paul is addressing himself” in Rom 2:1–11.

⁴⁹ Sanday and Headlam, *Commentary*, 54; Huby, *Épître aux Romains*, 107; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.124; Wiard Popkes, “Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32,” *NTS* 28 (1982): 490–501[497, 499]; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 79; Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 39; Byrne, *Romans*, 80.

⁵⁰ For the David–Nathan analogy, see Stowers, “Text as Interpretation,” 21–22. In contrast to Stowers, Thorsteinsson (*Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 186–87), who also identifies the interlocutor as a Gentile, acknowledges the appropriateness of the David–Nathan analogy to a certain extent but denies that the turn at Rom 2:1 is, like Nathan’s turning on David, unanticipated by Paul’s Gentile audience.

The qualification, “in his 1994 *A Rereading of Romans*,” as it turns out, is important; for Stowers is the first representative of two scholars with varying views moving in the opposite direction. In this 1994 monograph, after having identified the interlocutor as the “pretentious person” (*ho alazōn*; cf. Rom 1:30), Stowers then states: “There is absolutely no justification for reading 2:1–5 as Paul’s attack on ‘the hypocrisy of the Jew.’ No one in the first century would have identified the *ho alazōn* with Judaism.”⁵¹ This statement suggests a shift from his 1981 assessment in which he said, “The form of the discourse changes at 2:1, but not the subject, which is the indictment of the Gentiles, or perhaps *all men*,” implying an openness to Jewish inclusion.⁵² For N. T. Wright the movement is in the opposite direction. In an essay originally published in 1996 he asserted: “The general opening in 2.1ff. is to be taken as exactly that, a general opening, not as a covert way of attacking Israel before the open assault in 2.17.”⁵³ In his 2002 commentary, however, Wright says, “[T]he repeated emphasis on ‘the Jew first and

⁵¹ Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 101. Note that Stowers’s statement, especially because it is so exaggerated, is easy to dispute. The parallels with *Pss. Sol.* 15:8; Tob 4:8–10; Wis 15:1–4 (cf. p. 66 and p. 71) provide considerable justification for reading Rom 2:1–5 as an attack on Jewish hypocrisy. Moreover, Wis 2:16 suggests that a Jew could be and was, in fact, identified as a “pretentious person,” or *ho alazōn*. This verse is part of the first speech of the wicked (Wis 1:16–2:24), in which they display false reasoning as their thought progresses from a materialistic assessment of life, to hedonism, oppression, and eventually to testing the claims of the just one (to have knowledge of God and a blessed end) by putting him to death. In Wis 2:12–20, this righteous person is represented as a Jew who not only reproaches the wicked for “sins against the Law” (ἁμαρτήματα νόμου; Wis 2:12) but also “boasts that God is [his] father” (ἁλαζονεύεται πατέρα θεόν; Wis 2:16; cf. Wis 2:18; 18:13; Exod 4:22–23). This devout Jew, in other words, is depicted as a “pretentious person” precisely in his claim to divine sonship.

⁵² Stowers, *Diatribē*, 112, italics mine. On the same page Stowers makes it clear that what he opposes is restricting the indictment to Jews. He states, “Finally, it is anachronistic and completely unwarranted to think that Paul has only the Jew in mind in 2:1–5 or that he characterizes the typical Jew.”

⁵³ N. T. Wright, “The Law in Romans 2,” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. James D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 131–50[147]. On the same page, Wright compares the turn to Israel at Rom 2:17 to the “well-known turn at Amos 2:6.” The volume in which this essay appears was first published by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) in the WUNT series in 1996.

also the Greek' in 2:9-10, and the emphasis on those under the law and those outside the law being treated the same in 2:12-15, make better sense if, behind the screen of 'whoever you are' in v. 1, Paul envisages as his hypothetical listener not just a pagan moralist but a moralizing Jew."⁵⁴

Such varying views, shared analogies, and conflicting claims call for caution once again as we proceed. There are, then, three possibilities to consider for identifying the interlocutor of Rom 2:1ff.: (1) a Jew; (2) a Gentile; or (3) a generic judge, whether Jew or Gentile.⁵⁵ Because the Jewish identification is so frequently related to pavement stone four, the possible dialogue partner in Wisdom, I will discuss this possibility last. Accordingly, we begin with the Gentile view.

⁵⁴ Wright, "Letter to the Romans," 438.

⁵⁵ A fourth possibility is that the interlocutor is a Jewish believer in Jesus. This is the position advocated by Paul S. Minear, *The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans* (SBT Second Series 19; London: SCM, 1971), 46–56. His primary reason for this view is that the verb κρινω occurs 10x in Rom 2–3 (2:1, 3, 12, 16, 17; 3:4, 6, 7) but nowhere else in Romans except for chapter 14 (vv. 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 22) where the term is essential to the description of the "weak in faith" whom Minear takes to be Jewish believers in Jesus. Minear's identification, however, is unconvincing. First, while he is correct about the verb κρινω occurring only in Rom 2–3 and 14, its cognates occur throughout Romans (κριμα in 2:2, 3; 3:8; 5:16; 11:33; 13:2; κατάκριμα in 5:16, 18; 8:1; κατακρινω in 2:1; 8:3, 34; 14:23; διακρινω in 4:20; 14:23). This significantly mitigates the force of Minear's primary argument. Second, as Tobin (*Paul's Rhetoric*, 407) observes the divisions between the weak and strong in Rom 14 cut across ethnic lines: "Paul himself provides evidence for this." Third, even if we identify the "weak" of Rom 14 primarily with Jewish believers in Jesus and the "strong" primarily with Gentile believers in Jesus (so e.g. Francis Watson, "The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1–15:13," in *The Romans Debate* [rev. ed.; ed. Karl P. Donfried; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991], 203–15[esp. 203–205]), this does not require identifying the interlocutor of Rom 2:1ff. as a Jewish believer in Jesus. Indeed, Minear himself is careful to distinguish between the Gentiles of Rom 1:18–32 and the Gentile believers in Jesus of Rom 14 (see p. 49). Why could not a similar distinction be made between the Jew of Rom 2:1ff. and the Jewish believers in Jesus of Rom 14? Fourth, Paul's portrayal of the interlocutor as storing up wrath for himself makes it extremely unlikely that he is a Jewish believer in Jesus. Fifth, Gathercole (*Where Is Boasting?* 197–98) notes the following regarding the term Ἰουδαῖος in Rom 2: "Although Paul is quite happy to describe Jewish Christians as *Ioudaioi* [Gal 2:13, 14, 15; Col 4:11], the discussion in Romans 2:25–29 points toward a meaning of *Ioudaios* in 2:17 as an 'outward' Jew, the Jew in public. This nomenclature is polemically redefined by Paul in 2:28–29, such that the one who calls him or herself a Jew is actually not a Jew: the true Jew is the one whose heart is circumcised by the Spirit."

Gentile

The Gentile identification of the interlocutor represents the minority report of scholarship.⁵⁶ Among the arguments cited in support of this view, four deserve consideration.⁵⁷ First, assuming that Rom 1:18–32 concerns exclusively Gentile idolatry and immorality (except perhaps for the “all” of 1:18), the close connection between this text and Rom 2:1–11 could suggest a Gentile interlocutor.⁵⁸ This close connection is maintained not only by an inferential *διό* but also by shared vocabulary (*ποιέω*: 1:28, 32; 2:3; *πράσσω*: 1:32 [2x]; 2:1, 2, 3; *αὐτά*: 1:32; 2:1, 3; *τοιαῦτα*: 1:32; 2:2, 3). Second, the mode of address, *ὦ ἄνθρωπε* (“O human”), in 2:1, 3 may support a Gentile identification. Stowers objects to a theological reading of *ἄνθρωπος* as implying that all of humanity stands under the glare of Paul’s indictment here. He notes that “The expression in 2:1 and 3 is a common, everyday form of address equivalent to ‘Hey, mister,’ ‘fellow,’ or ‘sir.’”⁵⁹ Although in agreement with Stowers, Thorsteinsson says:

⁵⁶ My own survey of scholarship has yielded only six proponents of this view: Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 101–3; Johnson, *Reading Romans*, 36, a “Hellenistic moral teacher”; Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, 151; Thorsteinsson, *Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 188–94; Diana M. Swancutt, “Sexy Stoics and the Rereading of Romans 1.18–2.16,” in *A Feminist Companion to Paul* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff; Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2004), 42–73[43–53], a “Stoic sage”; Keck, *Romans*, 74–75.

⁵⁷ Thorsteinsson (*Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 122, 151–52, 191–94) provides two further arguments for a Gentile identification of the interlocutor, neither of which is compelling. The first assumes that since the recipients were Gentiles, the interlocutor must have been one of them. The exclusively Gentile identity of the recipients, however, is unlikely (cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 70–72; for a critique of A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], see Karl P. Donfried, “Review of *Solving the Romans Debate* by A. Andrew Das,” *TS* 69 [2008]: 189–90; James C. Miller, “Review of *Solving the Romans Debate* by A. Andrew Das,” *Int* 62 [2008]: 211). Moreover, even if one adopts the position that the recipients were Gentiles, it does not necessarily follow that the interlocutor must be a Gentile. Das (*ibid.*, 87–89) has no problem identifying Rom 2:17ff. as an apostrophe to a Jewish interlocutor even though he identifies the recipients as Gentiles. Such a view implies that the potential Jewish identity of the interlocutor in Rom 2:1ff. cannot be ruled out *a priori* simply because the Roman Christian community is regarded as exclusively Gentile. The second argument provided by Thorsteinsson is that the parallels between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis 11–15 suggest that “behind Paul’s utterance in [Rom] 2:4 lies the thought of the opportunity for repentance given by God to Gentiles...” (p. 192, material in brackets

At the same time, however, it should not be ruled out that by the vocative ἄνθρωπε Paul intends to connect the person addressed with the ἄνθρώπων mentioned in 1:18, which, in turn, supports the conclusion that the interlocutor is precisely one of them. If so, it should be recalled that Paul's words in 1:18 are not related to all humanity but to a particular group of 'men,' viz. gentiles.⁶⁰

Third, one may point to the subsequent apostrophe to a Jewish interlocutor in

Rom 2:17ff. as an indication that the person addressed in Rom 2:1ff. is a Gentile. Luke Timothy Johnson, for example, contends that whereas in Rom 2:1ff. Paul "has in mind ... the Hellenistic moral teacher, the sage who purports to identify and condemn the vices of others," in Rom 2:17ff. Paul "engages another imaginary interlocutor, this time one who styles himself a Jew."⁶¹ Fourth, for some scholars the association between the interlocutor and idolatry is decisive in favor of a Gentile identification. Esler has already been cited to this effect (cf. p. 55).⁶²

mine). Yet, besides Wis 15:1, none of the texts cited by Thorsteinsson to support his interpretation (Exod 34:6–7; Neh 9:17; Joel 2:13; 1 Esd 5:58; Sir 5:4–7; Pss 25[24]:7–8; 86[85]:5; 145[144]:7–9; *Pss. Sol.* 5.12–15; see *ibid.*, 192, n. 123 and n. 124) share extensive parallels with Rom 2:4 and Rom 1:18–32. This is significant because it is the turn Paul's argument takes in light of these parallels considered as a whole that suggests Paul is utilizing a Jewish interlocutor's own beliefs against him.

⁵⁸ According to Stowers (*Rereading of Romans*, 342, n. 34), "Paul strongly links 1:32 to 2:1ff. The emphatic linkage shows that 1:32 speaks of gentiles in Paul's own day because 2:1–16 has present-day gentiles in view."

⁵⁹ Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 102.

⁶⁰ Thorsteinsson, *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans* 2, 189.

⁶¹ Johnson, *Reading Romans*, 36, 39.

⁶² See also Keck's (*Romans*, 60) comment that the content of Rom 1:20–32, namely "the consequences of idolatry," is not applicable to Jews.

Generic Judge

The generic judge identification of the interlocutor (i.e. Jew or Gentile) occupies the middle ground both in terms of position and number of proponents.⁶³ Among the scholars surveyed for this dissertation, Richard H. Bell provides the best arguments for this view, three of them on its behalf and two in response to possible objections. I shall begin with his arguments on behalf of the generic judge identification. First, the logic of Rom 1:18–2:16 supports this view: “Rom. 1.18-32, which concerns the sin of Jew and Gentile, is continued in Rom. 2.1ff by addressing those self-righteous Jews and Gentiles, who believe the comments of Rom. 1.18-32 do not apply to them.”⁶⁴ Second, the “language of 2.1-16 appears quite general” as does the address of the interlocutor as ὁ ἄνθρωπος in Rom 2:1, 3, “which specifies neither Jew nor Gentile.” Third, “if 2.1ff were to concern just the Jew, the argument in 2.17ff, where the Jew is specifically mentioned, would seem to duplicate Paul’s argument in 2.1ff.” In light of these observations, Bell

⁶³ Scholars holding this position include: Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (1st and 2d ed.; Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Leipzig: Deichert, 1910), 104–5, n. 2; idem, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (3d ed.; Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Leipzig: Deichert, 1925), 106, n. 2; Schlatter, *Romans*, 47–48; Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, 42–43 [1957 edition]; idem, *Epistle to the Romans*, 41–42 [1991 edition]; Leenhardt, *Epistle to the Romans*, 73–75; André Viard, *Saint Paul Épitre aux Romains* (SB; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1975), 66–68; Stowers, *Diatribes*, 112; Elliott, *Rhetoric of Romans*, 125–26; Laato, *Paul and Judaism*, 86, 89; Bell, *No One Seeks for God*, 137–38; Wright, “Law in Romans 2,” 147–48; Seifrid, “Unrighteous by Faith,” 120–21; Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric*, 110–12; Frid, “How Does Romans 2.1 Connect to 1.18–32?” 127; Jewett, *Romans*, 197–204. Note that Jewett connects his interpretation to the congregational situation in Rome and especially to Rom 14. For a similar view, see: Angelika Winterer, “Ein Konflikt zwischen ‘Starken’ und ‘Schwachen’: Anlass für die Gestaltung und Gewichtung von Röm 1,18–32,” in *Was die Bibel mir erzählt: Aktuelle exegetische und religionsdidaktische Streiflichter auf ausgewählte Bibeltexte. Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Franz Laub* (ed. Herbert Stettberger; Bibel – Schule – Leben 6; Münster: LIT, 2005), 139–49.

⁶⁴ Bell, *No One Seeks for God*, 138. Bell points to the allusion to Ps 106(105):23 in Rom 1:23 as evidence that Paul’s indictment in Rom 1:18–32 concerns Gentiles and Jews. See p. 25, n. 25. All of the quotations from Bell which follow in the paragraph above and the next one come from p. 138.

concludes that Paul aims Rom 2:1 ff. at anyone who presumes the moral high ground, whether Gentile or Jew.

The two objections Bell considers are that the apostrophe to the Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:17 suggests Paul has been addressing a Jew all along and that the comments on the need for repentance in Rom 2:4–5 imply that the interlocutor is in a covenantal relationship with God, that is, a Jew. In reply to the first objection, Bell contends that “this problem can be overcome by saying that 2.1–16 is about the Gentile and *the Jew*.”⁶⁵ As for the second objection, Bell denies this implication. The reason is because Rom 2:9–10 suggests that God desires repentance from both Jews and Gentiles.

As a prelude to offering my own assessment, three observations are in order. First, Bell’s three positive arguments parallel the first three arguments provided for the Gentile identification of the interlocutor (cf. p. 59 above). Second, it is somewhat inconsistent for Bell to cite in favor of his Gentile view the potential redundancy introduced by the apostrophe to a Jew in Rom 2:17ff. if the interlocutor of Rom 2:1 ff. was also identified as a Jew, and then, at the same time, find merit in the objection that “Rom 2.17 seems to assume Paul has already been addressing the Jew.”⁶⁶ If Rom 2:17ff. does, indeed, assume a prior Jewish address, a position which Bell’s reply to this objection takes for granted, then this mitigates the charge of redundancy.⁶⁷ Third, many scholars who subscribe to the

⁶⁵ Bell, *No One Seeks for God*, 138, italics his.

⁶⁶ Bell, *No One Seeks for God*, 138.

⁶⁷ Seifrid (“Unrighteous by Faith,” 120, 121, n. 41) comes close, if not succumbs, to a similar inconsistency in stating, on the one hand, that “the two figures found in Romans 2:1–16 and Romans 2:17–29 (and the charges which Paul lays against them) are obviously associated, but they are certainly not identical” and, on the other hand, in response to Bell, that Rom 2:17–29 “represents a development of the

generic judge view tend to favor one ethnic identity over the other. Thus, for example, in his discussion of Rom 2:1–11 Thomas H. Tobin describes the interlocutor as a “fictitious person” who acts hypocritically, but when he comes to Rom 2:17–29 Tobin says, “This time ... the fictitious addressee is a Jew rather than a Gentile.”⁶⁸ In contrast, Mark A. Seifrid favors the Jewish identity. Although he initially identifies the interlocutor as “nothing more than a ‘human being’” because, in his view, “Ethno-cultural questions do not come front and center in Paul’s argument until Romans 2:17–29,” Seifrid nonetheless later places considerable emphasis on such questions in Rom 2:1–16 when he says:

Paul’s reintroduction of the pairing ‘Jew’ and ‘Greek’ (Rom 2:9–11) and his discussion of Gentiles without the Law (Rom 2:12–16) indicate that he has a Jewish failure in view here, its broader, human relevance notwithstanding.... In other words, Paul is here treating a fault which was common among Jews, *as a human problem*.⁶⁹

The tendency to favor one ethnic identity over the other, the inconsistency regarding the redundancy or lack thereof of Rom 2:17ff., and the overlap with the arguments for the Gentile identification point to the instability of the generic judge view. One, of course, might object that such observations hardly render the stance unstable; rather, they are precisely what ought to be expected given that this view occupies the

argument of Rom 2:1–16, not a reduplication of it,” and “it is more likely that Paul [in Rom 2:1–16] already has in view the Jewish misunderstanding which he subsequently attacks [in Rom 2:17–29].”

⁶⁸ Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric*, 110–13, 115. In his 1993 article (“Controversy and Continuity in Romans 1:18–3:20,” *CBQ* 55: 298–318[308]) Tobin shows his preference for the Gentile side of the identity even more clearly: “Romans 2:12–16 serves as a transition passage from an argument that dealt primarily with Gentiles (Rom 1:18–2:11) to an argument that deals primarily with Jews (Rom 2:17–29).” Later in *Paul’s Rhetoric* (331–32, n. 23), however, in commenting on ὁ ἄνθρωπος of Rom 9:20, Tobin once again stresses the generic judge identification of the interlocutor when he says, “Paul has used this form of address before, in 2:1, 3, where at first it seems to refer to a hypocritical Gentile but, as one reads further, it comes to apply to any hypocrite, either Jew or Gentile.”

⁶⁹ Seifrid, “Unrighteous by Faith,” 116, 121, italics his.

middle ground between ethnic extremes. This may be so but the generic judge position nonetheless has two problems to overcome. The first, already noted in chapter one, is accounting for the Jew/Gentile polarity that pervades Romans (1:16; 2:9, 10; 3:9, 29; 9:24; 10:12). This polarity suggests that the interlocutor is to be associated with one or the other of these ethnic identities, but not both at the same time.

The second, and more significant, problem relates to the claim that Rom 2:4–5 portrays the interlocutor as one who is in a covenantal relationship with God, that is, a Jew. As we have seen, Bell’s response to this claim is to focus on the issue of repentance and he cites Rom 2:9–10 as evidence that God desires repentance from both Jews and Gentiles. This response, however, is inadequate. The issue in Rom 2:4–5 is not merely repentance but presumption upon divine favor which makes repentance unnecessary. And it is at this point that even scholars who identify the interlocutor as a generic judge nonetheless describe him as if he was a Jew. C. K. Barrett, for example, having initially stated that Paul’s thought in Rom 2:1–16 “applies to both Gentiles and Jews,” when he comes to Rom 2:4–5, says, “The full force of this accusation will be felt if we set beside it words from Wisdom (which Paul evidently knew).”⁷⁰ He then cites Wis 15:1–4, noting that both this text and Rom 2:4–5 are preceded by vice lists (cf. Wis 14:22–26; Rom 1:29–31). Following the citation of Wis 15:1–4, Barrett concludes:

This passage describes the critic Paul has in mind. He is (he thinks) superior to the idolater; even if he does sin he avoids the really fundamental sin of idolatry, and he belongs to the people of God, and is thereby assured of salvation. But God shows no such favouritism as is assumed here; judgement looks to deeds, not

⁷⁰ Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, 43, 44 [1957 edition]; idem, *Epistle to the Romans*, 41, 43 [1991 edition].

privilege. *The Jew boasts of God's goodness; in fact he despises it, ignoring the fact that God's kindness is intended to lead you to repentance.*⁷¹

The question for Barrett, and those sympathetic to his position, is whether Rom 2:4–5, especially when compared to Wis 15:1–4, highlights only one aspect of the interlocutor's intermediary (Jew–Gentile) ethnic identity, or instead suggests that Paul's initially indefinite portrayal quickly, and decidedly, takes on a Jewish hue. With this question in mind, we turn to the arguments for identifying the interlocutor as a Jew.

Jew

Although not prominent in the first few centuries of Church history,⁷² the Jewish identification of the interlocutor represents the majority position among scholars

⁷¹ Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, 45, bold typeface in original; italics mine [1957 edition]; idem, *Epistle to the Romans*, 43, bold typeface in original; italics mine [1991 edition]. Laato (*Paul and Judaism*, 86–89) also identifies the interlocutor as a generic judge but then depicts him as a Jew in light of the parallels between Rom 2:4–5 and Wis 15:1ff. Similarly, Leenhardt (*Epistle to the Romans*, 73–75, 77) regards the interlocutor as a generic judge but then later describes him as “too much inclined to rest in the divine favours and to forget his weakness as a man,” though this is in relation to Rom 2:9–11 and is not connected with Wisdom. In his critique of reading Rom 2:1–5 as a subversive counter to Wis 15:1–4, Elliott (*Rhetoric of Romans*, 173–81), as Gathercole (*Where Is Boasting?* 198) has observed, “interacts with the far weaker arguments of A. Nygren ... rather than Dunn’s comprehensive survey of the relationship between 2:1–5 and the extant texts, Wisdom of Solomon and *Psalms of Solomon* in particular.”

⁷² For a brief survey of the history of interpretation on Rom 2:1, see Stowers, “Text as Interpretation,” 21–25. Stowers, however, wrongly attributes to Augustine a change in position. He says that initially Augustine related the interlocutor’s identity to Jews and Gentiles, i.e. the generic judge view (p. 22, n. 17; cf. Paula Fredriksen Landes, *Augustine on Romans: Propositions from the Epistle to the Romans: Unfinished Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [SBLTT 23, Early Christian Literature 6; Chico: Scholars, 1982], 4–5), but that later Augustine regarded him only as a Jew (p. 22; cf. Augustine, “The Spirit and the Letter,” in *Augustine: Later Works* [ed. John Burnaby; LCC 8; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955], 182–250[227]). In the former text, however, Augustine says the following regarding Rom 2:1: “*Omnis autem cum dicit, subintrat iam ut monstret non solum gentilem sed etiam Iudaeum qui secundum legem volebat iudicare de gentibus*” (“Moreover, when he [Paul] says ‘every man,’ he introduces an indictment not only of the Gentile but also of the Jew, who wished to judge the Gentiles according to the Law” [Landes trans.]). The phrase “non solum gentilem” (“not only of the Gentile”) likely refers to the preceding indictment in Rom 1:18–32, while “sed etiam Iudaeum” (“but also of the Jew”) refers to Rom 2:1ff. In other words, the early Augustine, like the later one, identified the interlocutor as a Jew.

throughout the past century.⁷³ Among the reasons proposed for this view, three deserve mention. First, although initially addressed quite generally as ὁ ἄνθρωπε (“O human”), the overall characterization of the interlocutor supports a Jewish identification. Aside from Rom 2:4 and Wis 15:1–4, consider the following two parallels:⁷⁴

Table 2. Rom 2:3, 5 and *Pss. Sol.* 15.8; Tob 4:8–10 Parallels

Rom 2:3	<i>Pss. Sol.</i> 15.8
³ λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο, ὃ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτά , ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ;	⁸ καταδιώξονται δὲ [Λιμὸς καὶ ῥομφαία καὶ θάνατος] ἁμαρτωλοὺς καὶ καταλήμψονται, καὶ οὐκ ἐκφεύξονται οἱ ποιῶντες ἀνομίαν τὸ κρίμα κυρίου .
³ But consider this, O human, who judges those practicing such things and does the same things, will you escape the judgment of God?	⁸ But [famine and sword and death] will pursue and overtake sinners and those doing lawlessness shall not escape the judgment of the LORD.

Rom 2:5	Tob 4:8–10
⁵ κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ	⁸ ὥς σοὶ ὑπάρχει, κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος ποιήσον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐλεημοσύνην, ἐὰν ὀλίγον σοὶ ὑπάρχη, κατὰ τὸ ὀλίγον μὴ φοβοῦ ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην, ⁹ θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάγκης , ¹⁰ διότι

⁷³ Those advocating this position include: Godet, *Epistle to the Romans*, 99, 113–14; Sanday and Headlam, *Commentary*, 53–54; Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, 37–39; Dodd, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 30, 32; Nygren, *Romans*, 113–14; A. Feuillet, “Le Plan Salvifique de Dieu d’après l’Épître aux Romains: Essai sur la structure littéraire de l’Épître et sa signification théologique,” *RB* 57 (1950): 336–87[347]; Jacques Dupont, “Le Problème de la Structure Littéraire de l’Épître aux Romains,” *RB* 62 (1955): 365–97[392]; Stanislas Lyonnet, “Notes sur l’Exégèse de l’Épître aux Romains,” *Bib* 38 (1957): 35–61[38, n. 1]; Bornkamm, *Early Christian Experience*, 59, 69, n. 54; Althaus, *Brief an die Römer*, 22; G. Bouwman, “Noch einmal Römer 1,21–32,” *Bib* 54 (1973): 411–14[414]; Claus Bussmann, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur* (2d ed.; Frankfurt: Herbert Lang, 1975), 109; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.137–39; Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 68; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.123–24; Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 52–61; Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 122, 135–36; Popkes, “Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32,” 493, 499; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 78, 79, 81–83; Schmithals, *Römerbrief*, 83; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 297; Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification,” 198–99; Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 33, 38, 40; Byrne, *Romans*, 79–80; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 128–29; Schreiner, *Romans*, 103; Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting?* 197–200; Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 409; idem, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 197–99.

⁷⁴ Those who recognize the parallels between Rom 2:3 and *Pss. Sol.* 15.8 include: Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 81; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 300; Byrne, *Romans*, 84; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 132; Jewett, *Romans*, 200. Those who recognize the parallels between Rom 2:5 and Tob 4:8–10 include: Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 84; Byrne, *Romans*, 85.

ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ	ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται καὶ οὐκ ἔῃ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ σκότος
⁵ And, according to your hard and unrepentant heart, you are storing up for yourself wrath on the day of wrath and the revelation of the just judgment of God.	⁸ As you have an abundance, give alms from it; if you have little, according to that little; do not be afraid to do alms, ⁹ for you are storing up for yourself a good deposit on the day of necessity, ¹⁰ because alms deliver from death and do not permit entrance into the darkness....

Both parallels suggest that Paul is attempting to turn a *Jewish* interlocutor's own beliefs against him. Paul shares with *Pss. Sol.* 15.8, and presumably the interlocutor, the assumption that doing evil incurs the judgment of God. What Paul challenges is the interlocutor's presumption that he is not liable to such judgment because he is innocent of evil.⁷⁵ Similarly, with regard to Tob 4:8–10 (cf. also *Pss. Sol.* 9.5), Paul embraces the view that one's actions "store up" a coming recompense; what he challenges is the nature of that recompense precisely because of the interlocutor's actions. Significantly, additional parallels between Deut 9:27; 10:16 and Rom 2:5, likely inspired by Ps 106(105):23, which I shall discuss at length in chapter five, further suggest that Paul does not criticize this interlocutor from outside the Jewish tradition but from within it. As Ulrich Wilckens observes, "μετάνοια ["repentance"] is found elsewhere in Paul only in 2 Cor 7:9f. The context of Rom 2:3ff. is traditional. The subject of repentance plays a central role in the tradition-history of Deuteronomic preaching which is effective right into the early-Christian period"⁷⁶ The parallels, in other words, imply that Paul is

⁷⁵ The claim of Thorsteinsson (*Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 190–91), in response to Dunn, that "if anything, the parallel evident here between these texts suggests that their authors both shared the conviction that sinful gentiles would not elude God's judgment" thus misses the point.

⁷⁶ "μετάνοια findet sich bei Paulus sonst nur noch 2Kor 7,9f. Der Kontext von Röm 2,3ff ist traditionell. Das Umkehrmotiv hat zentrale Bedeutung in der Traditionsgeschichte deuteronomistischer

playing the role of a deuteronomic prophet in calling this *Jewish* interlocutor to repentance.

While granting these Jewish parallels, one may nonetheless ask: Why, if Paul had a Jew particularly in mind, does he chose a generic address to introduce this person? Besides the observation that such an address is typical in diatribal style (cf. e.g. Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.19.26) and does not necessarily imply anything about the interlocutor's ethnic identity, two considerations commend themselves. One is that by addressing a *Jewish* interlocutor as ὦ ἄνθρωπε ("O human") Paul may be invoking the preceding two instances of the term ἄνθρωπος in Rom 1:18, 23. The connection with Rom 1:18 need not imply a Gentile identification, as Thorsteinsson argues (cf. p. 59). In this verse, God's wrath is called forth by "*all* impiety and unrighteousness of men." The term πᾶς ("all"), in particular, suggests that ἄνθρωπος here denotes Gentiles *and Jews*, even if the inclusion of the latter group emerges gradually.⁷⁷ Similarly, as we have seen, the worship of corruptible human images, along with animal icons, in Rom 1:23 is set within an allusion to *Israel's* fall into idolatry with the golden calf (cf. Ps 106[105]:20). The other consideration is that this designation for a *Jewish* interlocutor likely also stresses the finitude and frailty, the creaturely limitations of this one who arrogates to himself the role of judge, a role especially associated with God (Rom 3:6; though cf. 1 Cor 6:2).⁷⁸ In this

Predigt, die bis in die urchristliche Zeit hinein wirksam ist ...," Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.125, n. 280. With regard to the concept of repentance in the Pauline corpus, in addition to Rom 2:4, 5; 2 Cor 7:9, 10, see also 2 Cor 12:21 and 2 Tim 2:25.

⁷⁷ Cf. Tobin's (*Paul's Rhetoric*, 110) emphasis on this point even though he subscribes to the generic judge view.

⁷⁸ Cf. Watson (*Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 197–98): "The indefinite ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων ... is probably to be understood in the light of ὦ ἄνθρωπε in 9:20, i.e., in terms of the gulf between the

sense, Paul's propensity to use the expression κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ("according to man") provides an appropriate parallel (Rom 3:5; 1 Cor 3:3; 9:8; 15:32; Gal 1:11; 3:15). In 1 Cor 3:3, for example, the accusation that the Corinthians are σαρκικοί ("fleshly") is explicated by the further charge: κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε ("you walk according to man"). As Anthony C. Thiselton states regarding this verse, "Paul's prepositional phrase κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ... stands in contrast to the κατὰ πνεῦμα ["according to the Spirit"] ... which ought to have characterized their lives."⁷⁹ Given the association in 1 Cor 3:3 of ἄνθρωπος ("man") with σὰρξ ("flesh") in opposition to πνεῦμα ("Spirit"), it is intriguing, perhaps even corroboratory, to observe that in Rom 2:25–29 Paul contrasts the outer Jew who is circumcised "in the flesh" [ἐν σαρκί] with "the one who is a Jew in secret (and circumcision is from the heart by the Spirit [ἐν πνεύματι], not by the letter), whose praise is not from men but from God [οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ]" (v. 29).

This observation leads to the second reason for identifying the interlocutor of Rom 2:1 ff. as a Jew, namely the subsequent direction taken by Paul's argument. This is especially true of Rom 2:9–10, 12–16, and 17–24. With regard to Rom 2:9–10, in v. 5 the interlocutor, as we have seen, is charged with storing up wrath for himself on the day of wrath. The term translated "wrath" (ὀργή) next occurs in v. 8. This verse depicts "wrath and fury" (ὀργή καὶ θυμός) for those who are disobedient to the truth but obedient to unrighteousness. This depiction of impending doom for evildoers then continues in v. 9

creature and the Creator. In 9:20, this phrase shows up the presumption of the creature in answering back to the Creator, whereas in 2:1 it suggests that a sinful human being is trying to usurp the function of judgment that belongs to God alone."

⁷⁹ *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 294.

where it is stated that judgment is for Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος (“the Jew first and also for the Greek”). Conversely, v. 10 states that δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη (“glory and honor and peace”) await those who do good, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι (“the Jew first and also the Greek”). This emphasis on Jewish priority in judgment as well as reward is best explained if the interlocutor is a Jew in need of repentance.⁸⁰ Moreover, as noted in chapter one, the terms δόξα (“glory”) and τιμή (“honor”) may be found in or related to the evocation of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23. We shall return to this point in chapter five.

Turning to Rom 2:12–16, whether the Gentiles in this text are understood as morally upright pagans who keep the Law by nature or Christians who have experienced the New Covenant internalization of Torah foretold in Jer 31(38):33 (cf. Rom 2:15),⁸¹ the emphasis on obedience to the Law rather than possession of the Law supports identifying the interlocutor as an unrepentant Jew. As for Rom 2:17–24, Watson notes the following:

There are close thematic links between the two passages of second-person singular address (2:1–6, 17–24). The one who criticizes others (v. 1) is plausibly identified with the one who teaches others not to steal or commit adultery and who abhors idols (vv. 21–22). In vv. 1–6 Paul warns his interlocutor not to think that he will escape God’s judgment, since he does precisely the same things he condemns in others. This accusation is elaborated and made concrete in vv. 17–24. The continuity between the two passages suggests that they are addressed to the same person.⁸²

⁸⁰ So Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (1st ed.; HNT 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906), 12; idem, *An die Römer*, 37; idem, *An die Römer*, 38–39; idem, *An die Römer*, 38–39 [1933 edition]; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.138; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 297; Wright, “Letter to the Romans,” 438.

⁸¹ For the morally upright Gentile view, see e.g. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 297, 305–14. For the Gentile Christian view, see e.g. Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.138, 153–63; Gathercole, “A Law Unto Themselves,” 27–49.

⁸² Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 198.

Third, the parallels with Hellenistic Jewish excoriations of Gentile idolatry and immorality, not just Wis 13–15, but *Sib. Or.* 3.8–45; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81; *Let. Aris.* 128–171 as well, suggest that Paul is imitating a well-known Jewish *topos* in Rom 1:18–32, which further suggests that when in Rom 2:1ff. Paul turns on a person in agreement with such sentiments, he is almost certainly turning upon a fellow Jew.⁸³ As a prelude to discussing the fourth and final pavement stone, it is important to stress here that Paul’s potential engagement with Wis 11–19 (esp. chaps. 13–15), plays a prominent, sometimes dominant role, in the Jewish identification of the interlocutor.⁸⁴ As in chapter one, scholars often cite or allude to some portion of the subversive parallels between Rom 2:2–4 and Wis 11:23; 15:1–4 as evidence that Paul is indicting a Jewish interlocutor. The idea is that Paul is challenging the Jewish author of Wis 15:1–4 to embrace his own earlier teaching about the role of repentance in Wis 11:23 (cf. also Wis 12:10, 19). Consider the following:

Table 3. Wis 11:23; 15:1–4 and Rom 2:2–4 Parallels

Wis 11:23; 15:1–4	Rom 2:2–4
²³ ἐλεεῖς δὲ πάντας, ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι, καὶ παροργᾷς ἁμαρτήματα ἀνθρώπων εἰς μετάνοιαν....	² οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας.

⁸³ See e.g. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 79; Byrne, *Romans*, 64–65.

⁸⁴ This was noted in 1976 by Dieter Zeller (*Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus: Studien zum Römerbrief* [2d ed.; FB 8; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976], 149, n. 36), who said the main argument of scholars who identify the interlocutor of Rom 2:1ff. as a Jew is “V. 3–5, wo spezifisch jüdische Anschauungen über die Langmut Gottes verurteilt würden, wie sie sich vor allem Weish 11–15 fänden,” though Zeller, himself, doubted a direct reference to Wisdom here. For scholars holding to this view after 1976, see the immediately following discussion, esp. n. 88. Not all scholars who identify the interlocutor as a Jew, however, rely on parallels with Jewish literature such as Wis 11–15. According to Elliott (*Rhetoric of Romans*, 182), Thomas Schmeller (*Paulus und die “Diatriben”: Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation* [Münster: Aschendorff, 1987], 225–86) “has advanced an argument for reading 2.1–5 as an indictment of the Jew that is based first on internal, rhetorical clues rather than on perceived external corroboration....”

<p>15 ¹ Σὺ δέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, χρηστὸς καὶ ἀληθής, μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα. ² καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ἀμάρτωμεν, σοὶ ἐσμεν, εἰδότες σου τὸ κράτος· οὐχ ἄμαρ-τησόμεθα δέ, εἰδότες ὅτι σοὶ λελογίσμεθα. ³ τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαί σε ὁλόκληρος δικαιοσύνη, καὶ εἰδέναι σου τὸ κράτος ρίζα ἀθανασίας. ⁴ οὔτε γὰρ ἐπλάνησεν ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπων κακότεχνος ἐπίνοια οὐδὲ σκιαγράφων πόνος ἄκαρπος, εἶδος σπλωθέν χρώμασιν διηλλαγμένοις....</p>	<p>³ λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτά, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ; ⁴ ἢ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;</p>
<p>²³ But you have mercy on all, because you are capable of all things, and you overlook [the] sins of men for repentance....</p> <p>15 ¹ But you, our God, [are] kind and true, patient and governing all things with mercy. ² For even if we sin, we are yours, [since] we know your power: but we will not sin, [since] we are considered yours. ³ For to understand you [is] complete righteousness, and to know your power [is] the root of immortality. ⁴ For neither has the thought of the evil art of men misled us nor the fruitless toil of painters, a figure stained with various colors....</p>	<p>² But we know that the judgment of God is, according to truth, on those practicing such things. ³ But consider this, O human, who judges those practicing such things and does the same things, will you escape the judgment of God? ⁴ Or do you despise the wealth of his kindness and forbearance and patience, unaware that the kindness of God should lead you to repentance?</p>

C. E. B. Cranfield, for example, lists the relationship with Wisdom as the first of seven reasons for identifying the interlocutor as a Jew.⁸⁵ In relation to Rom 2:4, he notes that “both *χρηστός* [“kind”] and *μακρόθυμος* [“patient”] are used of God in Wis 15.1, and that the thought of patience (expressed by other words) occurs a number of times in Wisd 11–15” and then says:

That τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιαν ... ἄγει [“the kindness of God to repentance ... leads”] (in the sense of being intended and designed to produce it) was a well-established truth in Judaism is clear from, for example, Wisd 11.23; 12.10, 19; but the tendency was to recognize this with regard to the heathen but to fail to see that it was applicable also—and indeed particularly—to the Jew.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.138.

⁸⁶ Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.144–45, translation in brackets is mine.

James D. G. Dunn is even more explicit in drawing connections between Romans and Wisdom. In commenting on Rom 2:4, he may not list parallels with Wisdom as the first reason for identifying the interlocutor as a Jew but he does assign this potential relationship a final, climatic position. Dunn states:

Equally striking is the way once again Paul seems to have in mind the language and standpoint of the Wisdom of Solomon as an expression of Jewish, and not least of diaspora Jewish piety. Typical of Wisdom of Solomon is the confident assumption that God's mercy is upon his elect (3:9; 4:15), with a clear distinction drawn between God's mercy to his own (even when disciplining them) and his wrathful judgment on the ungodly (3:10; 11:9–10; 12:22; 16:9–10), and with repentance seen as something which the Gentiles need to be granted more than Israel (11:23—εἰς μετάνοιαν; 12:8–11, 19–22). *The particular passage which Paul may well have in mind is Wisd Sol 15:1 ff.*⁸⁷

Dunn then cites Wis 15:1–4 and says, “We will not go far wrong if we assume that it was the attitude expressed particularly in Wisd Sol 15:1–6 which Paul ‘heard’ being expressed by his Jewish interlocutor and as requiring the strong response of v 4....”⁸⁸

⁸⁷ Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 82, italics mine.

⁸⁸ Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 83. Many recent commentators on Romans share Dunn's view regarding Rom 2:1ff. (esp. v. 4) and Wis 15:1ff. Consider the following: Käsemann (*Commentary on Romans*, 53): “What follows [in Rom 2:1ff.] can be understood only as a polemic against the Jewish tradition which comes out most clearly and with much the same vocabulary in Wis 15:1ff.”; Fitzmyer (*Romans*, 298): “Thus when Paul addresses his Jewish interlocutor, he thinks in terms of the mode of Jewish existence depicted in the Book of Wisdom”; Byrne (*Romans*, 81): “So close, in fact, are the contacts in language and ideas [between Rom 2:4–5 and Wis 12:22; 15:1–3] that it is hard to believe that Paul is not writing with Wisdom specifically in mind”; Moo (*Epistle to the Romans*, 133): “[T]he text that stands out as particularly significant [for interpreting Rom 2:4], in the light of parallels between Wis. 11–15 and 1:18–32, is Wis. 15:1–2.... That Paul has this text in mind is probable...”; Gathercole (*Where Is Boasting?* 199): “As Käsemann puts it, on 2:1: ‘What follows can be understood only as a polemic against the Jewish tradition which comes out clearly and with much the same vocabulary in Wis 15:1ff.’”; Wright (“Letter to the Romans,” 439): “Again both drawing on and interacting with the book of Wisdom, he [Paul in Rom 2:4–5] describes God as being extremely patient, holding back from summary judgment to give people a chance to repent—but thereby inevitably storing up all the more wrath for the hard-hearted, who still refuse to do so”; Watson (*Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405, italics his): “There seems no good reason to doubt that Paul [in Rom 1:18–2:5] is consciously basing his argument on the template provided by *Wisdom*.”

This tendency to relate Rom 2:1ff. to Wis 15:1ff. has become so influential that it sometimes affects interpretation without being mentioned. Thus, Schreiner (*Romans*, 81, 103, 109–10), having earlier stated regarding Rom 1:18–32, “It has often and rightly been noted that this text reflects dependence on Jewish tradition, especially Wis. 11–15,” when he comes to Rom 2:3–4 says, “Most important, the attitude

Andrew T. Lincoln goes even further than Dunn. His interpretation of Rom 1:18–2:5 is suffused with references not just to Wis 11–15 but to chapters 16–19 as well, since in his view, “[T]he way in which the themes of Wisdom as a whole provide a most appropriate resource for Paul’s discussion in Romans 1 and 2” has not been sufficiently recognized.⁸⁹ Of course, not all scholars subscribe to this widespread tendency to relate Wisdom to a Jewish identification of the interlocutor in Rom 2:1ff, as exemplified by Cranfield, Dunn, and Lincoln, among others. Nonetheless, the number who do shows that the possible dialogue with Wis 11–19 requires careful consideration in any attempt to analyze the bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11. With these thoughts in mind, we now turn to our last pavement stone.

Possible Dialogue Partner: Romans 1:18–2:11 and Wisdom of Solomon 11–19

The fourth and final pavement stone is a possible dialogue with Wisdom. There are various ways of conceptualizing this relationship. One is to focus on the question of literary dependence or independence. In this case, the “or” is exclusive. Does Paul’s argument throughout Rom 1:18–2:11 reflect awareness of, even influence by, Wisdom, in particular, or simply knowledge of similar traditions? If one opts for the latter position, then the discussion may turn to comparative analysis. In other words, the distinct manner in which Paul and Wisdom treat the same topic or topics is elucidated through comparison and contrast. When reading the history of scholarship on Romans and

expressed in 2:3–4 fits Jews who would plead their covenantal relationship with God as protection against his wrath,” and refers to Dunn. In commenting on Rom 2:5 Schreiner does explicitly mention Wisdom along with *Pss. Sol.*, but the influence of the former text on his view of the preceding verses is clear, even if not explicit. In the subsection on pavement stone four, I trace the history of this influential view of Rom 2:1ff. and Wis 15:1ff.

⁸⁹ Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification,” 202.

Wisdom the paradigm of dependence or independence predominates. If one concentrates on discussions of Wisdom in relation to interpreting Rom 1:18–2:11, however, an alternate and, in my view, more adequate paradigm emerges. This manner of conceptualizing the relationship between Romans and Wisdom focuses on substantive endorsement or subversive engagement. In this case, the “or” may be exclusive or inclusive. It is exclusive for those who adopt the substantive endorsement pole of the paradigm since they regard the parallels between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis 13–15 as *only* an indication that Paul substantially endorses the Hellenistic Jewish perspective on Gentile idolatry and immorality in the latter text. On the other hand, the “or” is inclusive for those who adopt the “Subversive Engagement” end of the spectrum since they view the parallels between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis 13–15 as an indication that Paul both substantially endorses the Hellenistic Jewish critique in Wisdom *and also* subversively engages it by indicting a Jewish interlocutor beginning in Rom 2:1. For the sake of simplicity, I shall refer to these two readings as “Substantive Endorsement” and “Subversive Engagement,” rather than, for example, “Substantive Endorsement Only” versus “Substantive Endorsement and Subversive Engagement.” The important point to remember is that the “Substantive Endorsement” interpretation *excludes* the other pole of the paradigm, while the “Subversive Engagement” *includes* its opposite. As we shall see, the split between these two views is essentially the same as that between the Gentile and Jewish identifications of the interlocutor, with advocates of the generic judge position falling on either side of the divide.

The purpose of this section, then, is to elucidate these different ways of conceptualizing the relationship between Rom 1:18–2:11 and Wisdom.⁹⁰ It is composed of three parts. First, I review the history of scholarship on Romans and Wisdom in which the paradigm of dependence, independence, and then comparative analysis predominates. Second, I argue that it is inadequate to focus on the question of literary dependence or independence in trying to understand the transition between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11 in relation to Wisdom. Third, I propose substantive endorsement or subversive engagement as a replacement and briefly discuss scholarship on Rom 1:18–2:11 and Wisdom in light of this alternate paradigm.

Predominate Paradigm: Dependence, Independence, and Comparative Analysis

Literary Dependence

Eduard Grafe (1892). The contemporary discussion of Paul's relationship to Wisdom begins with Eduard Grafe's 1892 article entitled, "The Relationship of the Pauline Writings to the Wisdom of Solomon."⁹¹ Although the issue of whether Paul, in particular, and the NT, in general, show signs of Wisdom's influence was the subject of debate throughout the 19th century, especially in relation to the question of whether to include the Apocrypha in the Bible,⁹² Grafe's study is the first systematic treatment of

⁹⁰ Watson (*Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405, n. 77) hints at the contrasting paradigms I have identified but does not develop the point.

⁹¹ Eduard Grafe, "Das Verhältniss der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis," in *Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker zu Seinem Siebzigsten Geburtstage 11. December 1892* (ed. Adolf Harnack, et al.; Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1892), 251–86.

⁹² For the state of the question prior to 1892, see Grafe, "Verhältniss," 253–56 and A. T. S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes* (Oxford Church Bible Commentary; London: Rivingtons, 1913), 398–99. The first person to collate systematically NT texts with those from the Apocrypha appears to have been Christian Theophilus Kuinoel (Christian Gottlieb Kühnöl), *Observationes*

this topic.⁹³ Grafe discusses the parallels between Wisdom and Paul under three headings: (1) “Inconsequential Contacts”; (2) “Decisive Relations”; and (3) “The Remaining Noteworthy Parallels.” The “Inconsequential Contacts,” as the name implies, are points at which similarities between Paul and Wisdom are attributed to factors other than literary dependence. For example, Rom 10:20 and Wis 1:2 reflect the shared influence of Isa 65:1.⁹⁴

Turning to “Decisive Relations,” Grafe points to three texts, or textual complexes, in Paul which suggest the literary influence of Wisdom. The first and most important for Grafe concerns the doctrine of predestination (Rom 9:19–23; Wis 11:22; 12:8–22; 15:7). The parallels between Paul and Wisdom in relation to this doctrine are conceptual, terminological, and contextual.⁹⁵ Conceptually, Grafe first identifies three shared basic ideas: (a) The common notion of the omnipotence of God compared to which man is nothing [Rom 9:19–23; Wis 11:22; 12:12ff.]; (b) The peculiar notion that God treats his enemies leniently even though he knows such leniency is of no avail [Rom 9:22; Wis

ad Novum Testamentum ex libris apocryphis V. T. (Lipsiae: I. T. Feindium, 1794), who was followed shortly thereafter by Johann Karl Christoph Nachtigal, *Das Buch der Weisheit, als Gegenstück der Koheleth und als Vorbereitung zum Studium des N. T.* (vol. 2 of *Die Versammlungen der Weisen*; Halle: J. J. Gebauer, 1799). In the interim, Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (*Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* [Leipzig: Weidmann, 1795], 201–3) noted the similarity in content, not words, between Rom 1:20ff.; Wis 13:1ff. and Eph 6:13ff.; Wis 5:18ff., though he speculated that Paul and Wisdom could have shared a common source, whether oral or written.

⁹³ This is noted by Grafe himself at several points. See “Verhältniss,” 253, 255, 256.

⁹⁴ Besides Rom 10:20; Wis 1:2, Grafe (“Verhältniss,” 260–64) also discusses under “Inconsequential Contacts” the following texts: (1) Rom 5:2, 3; Wis 3:4; (2) 1 Cor 9:24, 25; 2 Tim 4:8; Wis 4:2; 10:12; (3) Phil 4:10; Wis 4:4; (4) Rom 11:25; 1 Cor 15:51; Eph 5:29–32; Wis 6:22; (5) Eph 1:17; Wis 7:7; (6) Rom 7:9; Wis 8:20; (7) Rom 8:3; Wis 8:20; (8) Rom 11:33, 34; Wis 9:13, 14. See pp. 263–64, n. 3 for a lengthy list of further “Inconsequential Contacts.”

⁹⁵ Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 264–70.

12:8, 10, 11a, 20a]; and (c) A comparison of the fate of God's enemies with that of God's children [Rom 9:22, 23; Wis 12:20–22]. Grafe further observes that in the same context in Rom 9:21 Paul employs the image of a potter and clay, which is also found in Wis 15:7. While this image may be quite common and its context and use in Wisdom is not the same as that in Paul, Grafe notes that the two texts are verbally reminiscent of one another and develop the metaphor in a distinctive direction: The potter makes, from one and the same substance, vessels for contrasting uses. Terminologically, besides Rom 9:21 and Wis 15:7, Grafe also points to lexical similarities between Rom 9:19–20; Wis 12:12 (esp. Rom 9:19b; Wis 12:12b) and Rom 9:22; Wis 12:20—that is, shared basic ideas (a) and (b) (cf. immediately above). Finally, Grafe offers a concluding contextual argument. The appearance in Romans and Wisdom of all three basic ideas in the same context, none of which entails another, two of which are distinctive ([b] and [c]),⁹⁶ and with significant lexical overlap in two of the three ([a] and [b]), points toward literary dependence.

The second decisive relation concerns the assessment of Gentile idolatry (Rom 1:18–32; Gal 4:8–10; Wis 11, 13, 15).⁹⁷ Although Grafe is careful to note differences in their respective treatments due to their unique purposes (e.g. the section in Wis 14:15ff. on the origin of idolatry has no parallel in Paul), he finds it especially significant that both Paul and Wisdom distinguish between two types of idolatry: The worship of heavenly bodies, which receives a mild rebuke (Gal 4:8–10 [cf. 1 Cor 12:2]; Wis 13:1–9);

⁹⁶ Although Grafe (“Verhältniss,” 265, 268) never explicitly refers to idea (c) as “eigenthümlich,” as he does idea (b), he does say that Paul and Wisdom develop the closely related image of the potter and the clay “nach der eigenthümlichen Richtung” and he explicitly refers to idea (a) as “nicht eigenthümlich.” All of this suggests that when, in his concluding contextual argument, Grafe (ibid., 270) says, “[A]lso sind von den drei Hauptgedanken zwei sehr origineller Natur,” he is referring to ideas (b) and (c).

⁹⁷ Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 270–74.

and the worship of images, including those of humans and animals, which receives a harsh rebuke (Rom 1:18–25; Wis 13:10ff. [cf. Wis 12:24]). Other parallels in their assessments of idolatry which lead Grafe to posit a literary relationship are similar forms of expression (cf. e.g. Rom 1:20; Wis 13:5) and a focus on the consequences of idolatry, including the notions that like is punished by like (Rom 1:28; Wis 11:15, 16; 12:27), idolatry is the source of immorality (Rom 1:24–32; Wis 14:12, 23–27), and humans are shameless about their deviance (Rom 1:32; Wis 14:22).

The third and final decisive relation concerns the connection between the body and soul (2 Cor 5:1, 4; Wis 9:15). Grafe thinks that the portrayal of the body as a σκῆνος (literally “tent”) which “weighs down” (βαρέω) the soul and from which a person longs to escape in 2 Cor 5:1, 4 reflects the influence of Wis 9:15, where σκῆνος and the term βαρύνω (“burden”), cognate to βαρέω, are utilized in service of a similar depiction. Grafe, however, disputes the thesis of Otto Pfleiderer that Wisdom, in particular, inspired a change in Paul’s theology from the bodily resurrection hope of Palestinian Judaism to the Alexandrian spiritualized hope of immortality. In Grafe’s view, while Paul’s theology did undergo such a change, it was due to experience; Wis 9:15 merely provided the language to articulate a conviction gained on other grounds.

Throughout his section on “Decisive Relations,” Grafe raises and responds to potential objections. For example, he anticipates the objection that the vice lists in Rom 1:29–31 and Wis 14:23–27 do not support his claim of literary dependence since they share only two terms in common (φόνος [“murder”] and δόλος [“deceit”] in Rom 1:29;

Wis 14:25). Having laid the foundation for his answer by setting the vice list of Romans within its larger context of 1:24–32, Grafe replies to this objection as follows:

Who would have wanted to assume that the Apostle had absorbed such an enumeration [i.e. of vices in Wis 14:23–27] into his memory? Each of the two authors emphasized the sins which lay closest to his experience. Yet, that is precisely the striking thing: both writers, since they have portrayed the essence and foolishness of idolatry, now also enumerate in broad exposition the immoral consequences so that the account culminates in the end with a catalogue in which, without discernible inner connection, sin follows upon sin. In two essential points, however, the portrayals of vice also overlap. Sexual sins are especially stressed (cf. Wis 14:12 πορνεία [“fornication”]; v. 26 γάμων ἀταξία [“disorder in marriages”], μοιχεία [“adultery”] with Rom 1:24) and among them expressly those contrary-to-nature, by Paul in a suggestive description (Rom 1:26, 27), by Wisdom through a brief indication (14:26 γενέσεως ἐναλλαγῇ [“inversion of gender”]).⁹⁸

This response of Grafe is important for two reasons. First, it illustrates how carefully he argues his case, even if it also displays his penchant for rhetorical flourish. Second, it highlights a critical assumption, namely that Paul’s literary dependence on Wisdom is mediated through his memory. Earlier, in commenting on the similarity, yet lack of exact agreement, between Rom 9:19b and Wis 12:12b, Grafe had said:

As his use of the LXX or even the Hebrew texts of the OT shows, the Apostle as a rule places no value on precise rendering. Most of his quotations are imprecise, freely given according to memory. If, however, that is already the case with the

⁹⁸ “Wer wollte annehmen, dass der Apostel eine solche Aufzählung wörtlich in sein Gedächtniss aufgenommen hätte? Jeder der beiden Schriftsteller hob die Sünden hervor, die ihm nach seinen Erfahrungen am nächsten lagen. Aber das ist eben das Auffallende, dass beide Verfasser, nachdem sie das Wesen und die Thorheit des Götzendienstes geschildert haben, nun auch die unsittlichen Folgen in breiter Ausführung aufzählen, so, dass zum Schlusse die Darstellung in einem Verzeichniss gipfelt, in dem ohne erkennbaren inneren Zusammenhang Sünde an Sünde gereiht wird. In zwei wesentlichen Punkten deckt sich aber die Schilderung der Laster auch inhaltlich. Die Unzuchtssünden werden besonders hervorgehoben (vgl. Sap. 14 12 πορνεία V. 26 γάμων ἀταξία μοιχεία mit Rm. 1 24) und unter ihnen ausdrücklich die widernatürlichen, von Paulus in andeutender Beschreibung (Röm. 1 26 27), von Sap. durch eine kurze Bezeichnung (14 26 γενέσεως ἐναλλαγῇ),” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 273–74. The translation of Greek and comments in the brackets are mine. Note that the inconsistency in abbreviating Rom as “Rm.” and “Röm” is in the original.

canonical Scriptures of the OT, then how much less will Paul have observed literal fidelity to reminiscences of the Apocrypha!⁹⁹

The consequence of this assumption about the mediatorial role of Paul's memory is that it provides a ready explanation for instances, such as the vice lists in Rom 1:29–31 and Wis 14:23–27, where the degree of overlap is less than might otherwise be expected. I shall return to the significance of this assumption at a later point.

Before discussing “The Remaining Noteworthy Parallels,” Grafe observes that the boundary between this category and the preceding one is fluid such that certain scholars may find some of these parallels as decisive, if not more so, than the three already identified.¹⁰⁰ Among the many textual parallels noted by Grafe, three are important for my purposes.¹⁰¹ First, concerning Rom 2:4; Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19, Grafe says, “[T]he common thought here is that the goodness and mildness of God have the aim of the *μετάνοια* [‘repentance’] of the sinner.”¹⁰² Second, Rom 2:4 is also reminiscent of Wis

⁹⁹ “Wie seine Benützung der LXX oder auch des hebräischen Textes des A. T.s zeigt, legt der Apostel auf genaue Wiedergabe in der Regel keinen Werth. Die meisten seiner Anführungen sind ungenau, frei nach dem Gedächtniss gegeben. Ist das aber schon bei den kanonischen Schriften des A. T.s der Fall, wie viel weniger wird Paulus bei Apokryphen-Reminiscenzen wörtliche Treue beobachtet haben!,” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 267.

¹⁰⁰ J. A. F. Gregg (*The Wisdom of Solomon: In the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes* [Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1909], lvi-lix), for example, largely follows Grafe, though he regards 2 Cor 5:1–5; Wis 9:15 as merely a possible point of contact but Eph 6:13–17; Wis 5:17 as “an undoubted connection,” a parallel which Grafe reserves for discussion under his final heading.

¹⁰¹ In addition to the parallels discussed in what follows, Grafe (“Verhältniss,” 277–85) also notes under this heading: (1) The later view of O. Pfleiderer that Paul's conception of the Spirit reflects the influence of Wisdom can be broadly maintained [cf. 1 Cor 2:8, 10, 11b; Wis 9:17 / 1 Cor 2:9–10; Wis 7:27–28 / 1 Cor 2:14, 15, 16 / Wis 9:11, 13, 14]; (2) Rom 11:32; Wis 11:23; (3) Eph 6:11ff.; Wis 5:17ff.; (4) Rom 5:12; Wis 2:24; (5) Rom 8:19ff.; Wis 1:13–14; (6) 1 Cor 15:32; Wis 2:5–7; (7) 1 Cor 6:2; Wis 3:8; (8) Rom 13:1, 6; Wis 6:3–5; (9) 1 Cor 10:4; Wis 10:17; 11:4; (10) Rom 8:33; Wis 12:12; (11) Gal 3:11, 13, 14; Wis 14:7, 8. For a lengthy list of further parallels, see pp. 283–85.

¹⁰² “[D]er gemeinsame Gedanke ist hier der, dass die Güte und Milde Gottes die *μετάνοια* des Sünders zum Zweck haben,” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 281, translation in brackets is mine. Note that the

15:1 in that the nouns *χρηστότης/χρηστόν* (“kindness”) and *μακροθυμία* (“patience”) correspond to the analogous adjectives *χρηστός* (“kind”) and *μακρόθυμος* (“patient”). Regarding this correspondence, Grafe comments: “Significantly, such a proximate combination of related terms is not to be considered natural.”¹⁰³ The third parallel is conceptual as opposed to textual or terminological. In reading Wis 15:2, Grafe says,

One virtually believes himself transplanted into the Pauline world of thought.... The ideas expressed here of righteousness and also of the sinner being reckoned to God and of saving power, which occur in this relation, do not indeed coincide in their contents [i.e. terminology] with similar sounding Pauline ones; however, the chosen manner of expression here would have seemed especially suitable to the Apostle, if he had wanted to describe thoughts like Rom 3:28; 5:1; 6:11–14 in the Greek language.¹⁰⁴

It must be observed that Grafe’s assessment of the harmony between Wis 15:2 and Pauline thought as well as his construal of Rom 2:4 in relation to Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19; 15:1 strike a discordant note with the tendency among many contemporary scholars to view Paul as opposing Wis 11:23; 15:1 ff. through the subversive turn his argument takes in Rom 2:1 ff. (cf. above pp. 71 ff.). Clearly this interpretation does not derive from Grafe. Moreover, from the fact that it is not even mentioned by him, much less

similarity between Rom 2:4 (misabeled as Rom 2:24) and Wis 11:23 (labeled as Wis 11:24) and Wis 12:10 (though not Wis 12:19) is observed as early as Rudolf Stier, *Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie* (Andeutungen für gläubiges Schriftverständniß im Ganzen und Einzelnen: zweite Sammlung; Leipzig: C. H. F. Hartmann, 1828), 500.

¹⁰³ “Als erheblich ist eine solche nahe liegende Combination verwandter Begriffe natürlich nicht zu betrachten,” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 281. Stier (*Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie*, 503) also notes the parallel between Rom 2:4 and Wis 15:1.

¹⁰⁴ “Geradezu in paulinische Gedankenwelt glaubt man sich versetzt.... Die hier ausgesprochenen Gedanken von der Gerechtigkeit und dem Gottzugerechnetsein auch des Sünders und von der heiligenden Kraft, welche in diesem Verhältniss liegt, decken sich ja nicht ihrem Inhalte nach mit den ähnlich lautenden paulinischen; aber die hier gewählte Ausdrucksweise mochte dem Apostel besonders geeignet erscheinen, wenn er Gedanken wie Röm 3 28 5 1 6 11–14 in griechischer Sprache wiedergeben wollte,” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 283, material in brackets mine.

advocated, one may presume (given the exhaustive nature of his account) that this interpretation did not yet exist. The question then arises: From where does it come? This is a question to which we shall return.

In summarizing the results of his detailed study, Grafe first observes that the most important connections between Paul and Wisdom are in Romans; indeed, two of his three “Decisive Relations” come from this epistle. As for the question of literary dependence, Grafe concludes it is most likely that Paul read Wisdom. He is, however, reluctant to ascribe to Wisdom any significant role in terms of influencing Paul’s thought. This is how Grafe puts it:

Clearly it may be said from the outset that dependence is more formal than substantive. A man of experience with a sharp eye for practical necessities, Paul has taken the good where it presented itself to him. Thus he also borrows from Wisdom a wealth of words, ideas, images and utilizes them to express his thoughts and convictions already gained from elsewhere. In a few not unimportant points, however, he also shows himself substantially influenced by Wisdom, thus in the doctrine of predestination, in eschatology, and in the assessment of paganism and its idolatry. Upon these regions, passages from Wisdom virtually cast light on the dark, difficult expositions of the Apostle.¹⁰⁵

William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam (1895). Shortly after Grafe another foundational study of the parallels between Romans and Wisdom appeared in the 1895 commentary of William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam.¹⁰⁶ Sanday and Headlam refer to

¹⁰⁵ “Zwar darf von vornherein gesagt werden, die Abhängigkeit ist mehr eine formelle als eine sachliche. Ein Mann des Lebens mit dem scharfen Blick für die praktischen Bedürfnisse, hat Paulus das Gute genommen, wo es sich ihm darbot. So entlehnt er auch Sap. eine Fülle von Worten, Vorstellungen, Bildern und verwendet sie zum Ausdruck seiner schon anderswoher gewonnenen Gedanken und Ueberzeugungen. In einigen nicht unwesentlichen Punkten zeigt er sich aber auch sachlich von Sap. beeinflusst, so in der Lehre von der Prädestination, in der Eschatologie und in der Beurtheilung des Heidenthums und seines Götzendienstes. Auf diesen Gebieten werfen geradezu Stellen aus Sap. Licht auf dunkle schwierige Ausführungen des Apostels,” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 285–86.

¹⁰⁶ William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1895), 51–52, 267–69.

the then recent work of Grafe but their own analysis appears to be largely independent from his. Significantly, they come to very similar conclusions. They point to the same two texts in Romans as “clear indications of the use by the Apostle of the Book of Wisdom.”¹⁰⁷ Their comparison of Rom 1:18–32 and Wisdom is both terminological and structural. To elucidate the similar terminology, selected statements from Rom 1:18–32 and Wisdom are arranged in corresponding columns. The following textual parallels are identified as a consequence:

(1) Rom 1:20	–	Wis 2:23; 13:1, 5, 8; 18:9
(2) Rom 1:21	–	Wis 13:1
(3) Rom 1:22	–	Wis 12:24
(4) Rom 1:23	–	Wis 12:1; 13:10, 13, 14; 14:8
(5) Rom 1:24, 26	–	Wis 14:12, 16, 22–24
(6) Rom 1:25	–	Wis 13:17; 14:11, 21
(7) Rom 1:29–31	–	Wis 14:25–26, 27

As for structural parallels, Sanday and Hedlam point to the same basic line of thought in Rom 1:18–32 and Wisdom: (1) Natural religion discarded; (2) Idolatry; and (3) Catalogue of immorality.

The second text is Rom 9:19–23. Before diving into details, Sanday and Headlam first observe that Rom 9–11 and Wis 10–19 both form a “Philosophy of History” in which the former text compares Moses and Pharaoh while the latter text compares the Israelites and Egyptians. Turning to the details, Sanday and Headlam point to three conceptual similarities and accompanying textual parallels. These concern: (1) The impossibility of resisting divine power [Rom 9:19–20; Wis 11:21; 12:12]; (2) Stress upon the forbearance of God towards the non-elect or his enemies [Rom 9:22, 23; Wis 12:10,

¹⁰⁷ Sanday and Headlam, *Commentary*, 51.

20–21a]; and (3) The image of the potter, even if employed in differing contexts and to distinct ends [Rom 9:21; Wis 15:7].

After identifying these parallels to Wisdom in Rom 1:18–32 and 9:19–23, Sanday and Headlam come to the same conclusion as Grafe. Although “there can be no question of direct quotation,” these parallels “suggest some definite literary obligation”; indeed, it is “clear that at some time in his life St. Paul must have bestowed upon the Book of Wisdom a considerable amount of study,” yet the influence of Wisdom upon Paul “did not extend to any of the leading ideas of Christianity and affected the form rather than the matter of the arguments to which it did extend.”¹⁰⁸

Three comments are in order concerning the study of Sanday and Headlam. First, the affinity between their observations on Rom 9:19–23 in relation to Wisdom and those of Grafe on the doctrine of predestination (cf. p. 77 above) is striking. Second, Sanday and Headlam do not point to Gal 4:8–10, as does Grafe, in an attempt to find the same distinction between classes of idolaters that is found in Wisdom. This may not amount to an implicit denial of Grafe, but it certainly is not an explicit endorsement either. Third, also unlike Grafe, Sanday and Headlam do not even note the parallels between Rom 2:4 and Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19; 15:1ff. Thus the widespread subversive reading of these texts, popular among contemporary Romans commentators (cf. above pp. 71ff.), does not derive from them either. So the question lingers: From where does it come?

¹⁰⁸ Sanday and Headlam, *Commentary*, 52, 268, 52, respectively. Note that Joseph R. Dodson (*The ‘Powers’ of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans* [BZNW 2/161; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008], 4–13) wrongly ascribes to Sanday and Headlam the view that the parallels between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis represent “direct quotations.” This is one of a number of errors in Dodson’s discussion of Sanday and Headlam, in particular, and in his review of literature, in general.

The studies of Grafe and Sanday and Headlam quickly found widespread acceptance. When discussed together, the tendency was to conflate their arguments, with the study of Grafe, especially his “Decisive Relations,” serving as the framework into which distinctive points drawn (either explicitly or implicitly) from Sanday and Headlam were inserted. The 1900 treatment of Henry St. John Thackeray may be cited as an example.¹⁰⁹ In Thackeray’s view, Paul’s use of non- or deuterocanonical Jewish literature can be established only in the case of Wisdom, even if there are no quotations from this book. To corroborate his claim, Thackeray summarizes the “exhaustive investigation” of Grafe. Although he rearranges Grafe’s “Decisive Relations” by placing Rom 1:18–32; Gal 4:8; Wis 13–14 first, he endorses all three. In his summary of the doctrine of predestination, he explicitly incorporates the work of Sanday and Headlam, referring to them throughout his discussion. He had, however, implicitly incorporated

¹⁰⁹ Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought: An Essay to Which Was Awarded the Kaye Prize for 1899* (London: Macmillan, 1900), 223–31. Other scholars who largely follow Grafe and secondarily incorporate Sanday and Headlam include: Gregg, *Wisdom of Solomon*, lvi–lix (cf. n. 100 above); Samuel Holmes, “The Wisdom of Solomon: Introduction,” in *Apocrypha* (ed. R. H. Charles; vol. 1 of *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 518–34[526–27]; and W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (New York: Macmillan, 1917), xix–xxii, although his discussion does not follow the framework of Grafe, he mentions Sanday and Headlam and in the end refers readers to Thackeray, quoting Thackeray’s conclusion, which itself is a quote of Grafe.

Richard Roberts (“St. Paul and the Book of Wisdom,” *International Journal of the Apocrypha* 18 [1909]: 58–60) endorses Sanday and Headlam on Rom 1:18–32 and 9:19–23 and then conducts his own discussion of these and other parallels. Although much of what he says is found in Grafe, he shows no awareness of Grafe’s work. This proves significant in Roberts’s discussion of Rom 1:18–32 in relation to Wis 13:1ff. Being unaware of the parallel Grafe draws to Gal 4:8–10, Roberts does not think Paul distinguishes between two classes of idolaters as does Wisdom.

Paul Heinisch (*Das Buch der Weisheit* [EHAT 24; Münster: Aschendorff, 1912], XLII–XLIII) endorses entirely all three of Grafe’s “Decisive Relations.” The stance of Goodrick (*Book of Wisdom*, 398–403) toward Grafe is at best ambiguous. On the one hand, he critiques Grafe’s view that the three “Decisive Relations” represent points where Paul has been substantially influenced by Wisdom. On the other hand, he concedes that Paul may have read Wisdom and even suggests that Paul wrote Romans right after doing so. Goodrick then concludes his discussion by quoting approvingly the first part of Grafe’s own conclusion cited above (cf. p. 83). Goodrick does not mention Sanday and Headlam.

their structural parallels of “(1) natural religion, (2) idolatry, [and] (3) catalogue of vices consequent upon idolatry,” in his earlier summary of the condemnation of idolatry.¹¹⁰

Eduard Norden (1906, 1913). Further contributing to this emerging scholarly consensus regarding the relationship of Paul (especially Romans) to Wisdom, though initially developing along an independent line, were two studies by Eduard Norden. The first, *Ancient Rhetorical Prose*, originally appeared in 1906. In this work, Norden suggested that the Stoic image of the competitor in 1 Cor 9:24ff. was likely mediated to Paul through Hellenistic Jewish literature, such as Wis 4:2.¹¹¹ More importantly, for my purposes, Norden also said that the parallels between Romans and Wis 13 made Paul’s knowledge of Wisdom “on internal grounds *a priori* most likely.”¹¹² This claim is significant because Norden was not then familiar with the literature on the subject. By the time of his later book, *Agnostos Theos* (“Unknown God”), which first appeared in 1913, Norden had become aware of Grafe’s work, though apparently not that of Sanday and Headlam since he fails to mention them.¹¹³ What is distinctive about Norden’s approach is that he emphasizes comparing entire passages with one another and consequently arranges Rom 1:18–23 and Wis 12:27–13:9 into parallel columns.¹¹⁴ Norden is even

¹¹⁰ Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, 224, material in brackets mine.

¹¹¹ Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa: Vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (5th unchanged ed.; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1958), 2.467, n. 2.

¹¹² “[E]s [Ob Paulus dieses Buch gekannt hat] ist ... aus inneren Gründen *a priori* höchst wahrscheinlich,” Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, 2.474, n. 2.

¹¹³ Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (4th unchanged ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956), 128, n. 1.

¹¹⁴ Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 128, 130–31.

critical of Grafe for inordinately focusing on individual thoughts and short phrases at the expense of the whole. Holistic comparison is necessary, in Norden's view, because Paul has so mastered his Wisdom source that he is able to paraphrase it in his own words and to his own ends. Norden identifies three differences between the Pauline paraphrase and its precursor. First, Paul restrains some of the Hellenistic philosophical elements found in Wisdom (e.g. the term τεχνίτης ["artisan"] is not retained). Second, Paul stresses more strongly than Wisdom God's wrathful judgment as found in the prophets. Correspondingly, third, "he finally removes the sounding of softer notes," namely that "human error is understandable and worthy of modest reproach since the beauty of the world dazzles their eyes."¹¹⁵

Significantly, Norden's third observation amounts to an implicit denial of Grafe's claim, on the basis of Gal 4:8–10, that Paul, like Wisdom, distinguishes between two classes of idolaters since the more refined nature worshipers are those who receive a modest reproach. As we shall see, this implicit denial finds explicit expression among those who oppose Grafe's thesis of literary dependence. It is also interesting to note that the subversive reading of Rom 2:4 in relation to Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19; 15:1 (cf. above pp. 71ff.) does not appear in Norden. And so we ask once again: From where does it come?

With one important exception (namely, the answer to the question I have just posed for the third time), the three studies of Grafe, Sanday and Headlam, and Norden provide the often unacknowledged foundation for the widespread scholarly view that

¹¹⁵ "... daß er endlich die bei diesem mitklingenden weicheren Töne — der Menschen Irrtum sei begreiflich und geringen Tadels wert, da die Schönheit der Welt ihre Augen blendete — beseitigt..." Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 129.

Paul knew Wisdom.¹¹⁶ Indeed, as C. Marvin Pate observes in a 2000 monograph, “[I]t is a commonplace among scholars today that Romans utilizes *Wisdom of Solomon*....”¹¹⁷ Pate, at least, refers to literature on this subject and argues for his view that Rom 8:3 and Gal 4:6–8 reflect Wisdom.¹¹⁸ Frequently, scholars simply refer to Paul’s knowledge or probable knowledge of Wisdom with little to no substantiation for this claim.¹¹⁹ That this has become standard practice is an indication of how influential the studies of Grafe, Sanday and Headlam, and Norden have become, whether or not these studies are known or acknowledged.

Literary Independence

Emil Weber (1905). Even as the literary dependence foundation of Grafe, Sanday and Headlam, and Norden was still in the process of being laid, fissures began to form,

¹¹⁶ Other important studies on the relationship between Wisdom and the NT, in general, and/or Paul, in particular, include: Hans Windisch, “Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag (14. März 1914) dargebracht von Fachgenossen, Freunden und Schülern* (ed. Gustav Adolf Deissmann and Hans Windisch; UNT 6; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914), 220–34; Casimir Romaniuk, “Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament,” *NTS* 14 (1968): 498–514; C. Larcher, *Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse (Ebib)* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969), 11–30; Eduard Schweizer, *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1970), 83–95; James Barr, *Biblical Faith and Natural Theology: The Gifford Lectures for 1991 Delivered in the University of Edinburgh* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 58–80; David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 149–52.

¹¹⁷ *The Reverse of the Curse: Paul, Wisdom, and the Law* (WUNT 2/114; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)), 233.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Pate, *Reverse of the Curse*, 139–45, 233–36.

¹¹⁹ Cf. e.g. George B. Caird, “Review of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*,” *JTS* 29 (1978): 538–40; Richard B. Hays, “Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell’s Exegesis of Romans 1,” *JRE* 14 (1986): 184–215[194]; idem, “Wisdom According to Paul,” in *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World* (ed. Stephen C. Barton; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 111–23[112]; Bruce W. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham’s God* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 48, n. 26.

especially on German soil.¹²⁰ As early as 1905, Emil Weber argued against Grafe's claim that Rom 1:18–32 reflects dependence on Wisdom.¹²¹ Overall, he advances four criticisms. First, Weber makes explicit what Norden, as we have seen, only implies: “Nothing is intimated in Gal 4:8f.; 1 Cor 12:2 about less coarse paganism”; indeed, “Paul has nothing of the sharp separation between coarser and more refined idolatry,” which is found in Wisdom.¹²² Second, Weber criticizes Grafe's attempt to bring Wisdom into line with Pauline thought (esp. Rom 1:18–21) by attributing idolatry, among the coarser brand of paganism, to immoral suppression of the knowledge of God. Grafe had referred to texts such as Wis 13:3–5, 9 (cf. Wis 1:12) and said that although “Men would have and must have been able to conclude from the glory of creatures to the still more glorious Creator,” yet “Not only have they not done that but also, precisely through their ἀδικία [“unrighteousness”] and κακία [“wickedness”], they have ultimately taken from themselves the possibility of the knowledge of God ([Wis] 11:15; 1:1–5; 2:21).”¹²³

¹²⁰ E. Earle Ellis (*Paul's Use of the Old Testament* [London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957], 77–80) is right to observe that Grafe's study received greater acceptance in the English world than on the Continent, though he neglects the partial critique of Goodrick (cf. n. 109 above).

¹²¹ Emil Weber, *Die Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus* (BFCT 9.4; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1905), 40–44[356–60]. Note that each page has two numbers on it: 40–44 reflect the pagination of *Die Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus* considered as its own work; 356–60 reflect the pagination of this work as part of the larger BFCT 9. Weber's arguments proved convincing to Siegfried Schulz, “Die Anklage in Röm. 1,18–32,” *TZ* 14 (1958): 161–73[169–70, n. 51].

¹²² “Von weniger grobem Heidentum ist Gal. 4, 8 f.; 1. Kor. 12, 2 nichts angedeutet. Paulus hat nichts von der scharfen Scheidung zwischen gröberem und feinerem Götzendienst,” Weber, *Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*, 41[357]. Interestingly, Goodrick (*Book of Wisdom*, 402) levels the opposite criticism against Grafe: He accepts Gal 4:8–10 as establishing two classes of idolatry in Paul but finds only one in Wisdom.

¹²³ “Die Menschen hätten aus der Herrlichkeit der Geschöpfe auf den noch herrlicheren Schöpfer schliessen können und müssen. Das haben sie nicht nur nicht gethan, sondern auch geradezu durch ihre ἀδικία und κακία sich schliesslich die Möglichkeit der Gotteserkenntniss genommen 11 15 1 1–5; 2 21,” Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 271.

Weber disputes the relevance of 1:1–5; 2:21; 11:15 to Wisdom’s stance on idolatry since these texts fall outside of the chapters devoted to this topic (Wis 13–15).¹²⁴ Moreover, Grafe’s position ignores an important contrast: Wisdom portrays the knowledge of God as something the Gentiles were unable to attain, and thus could not have suppressed, while Paul places the pure knowledge of God at the beginning of the overall development of paganism as something the Gentiles must have suppressed to descend into idolatry.¹²⁵

Third, Weber denies a common focus on the immoral consequences of idolatry. In his view, Wisdom does not, like Paul (Rom 1:23–27, 28–32), stress the inner-connection between idolatry and specific Gentile sins as well as immorality in general. Oddly, Weber fails to mention Wis 14:12, 27, two verses which are central to Grafe’s claim in this regard and seem to establish the very connection denied.¹²⁶ Weber does, however, deal with the vice list of Wis 14:23–27, which for Grafe clarifies the idea that idolatry is the source of all immorality. Weber says that this proportionally, very brief text appears to be “a second proof of Gentile foolishness and wickedness.”¹²⁷ Fourth, Weber points to a difference regarding the temporal horizon of judgment which Grafe neglects: Whereas Paul portrays the punitive consequences of idolatry presently in ever deepening religious-moral decline, Wisdom, with the exception of the Egyptians (Wis 11:15–16; 12:27), depicts punishment as an eschatological event. In the end, these four criticisms do not, for

¹²⁴ Weber, *Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*, 42–43[358–59].

¹²⁵ Weber, *Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*, 41–42[357–58].

¹²⁶ Cf. Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 273; Weber, *Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*, 42–44[358–60].

¹²⁷ “ein zweiter Beweis der heidnischen Torheit und Bosheit,” Weber, *Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*, 43–44[359–60].

Weber, rule out the possibility that Paul may have read Wisdom. What they do highlight, however, is the originality of Paul's thought. Indeed, Rom 1:18–32 is to be regarded as “a work of brilliant insight and of the psychology of the missionary to the Gentiles, and born out of his experiences.”¹²⁸

Friedrich Focke (1913). If criticism of Grafe began as early as 1905, it reached its high point in 1913. This is the year an appendix entitled “Paul and Wisdom” appeared in a monograph by Friedrich Focke devoted to the origin of Wisdom.¹²⁹ Focke seems to have been unaware of Weber's work, as well as that of Sanday and Headlam. He does, however, subject Grafe and Norden to an extensive critique, utilizing Grafe's “Decisive Relations” as his framework, since the thesis of literary dependence, in his view, stands or falls with these. In general, if Grafe and Norden emphasize the similarities between Romans and Wisdom while minimizing the differences, Focke takes the opposite approach. In particular, beginning with the doctrine of predestination, whereas Grafe had argued for literary dependence on conceptual, terminological, and contextual grounds (cf. p. 77 above), Focke disputes all three. Conceptually, he refers to shared basic idea (a), the omnipotence of God compared to the impotence of humanity, as an entirely vacuous agreement. Regarding ideas (b) and (c), God's treatment of his enemies and their fate along with that of the children of God, Focke points out that God's patience and mercy

¹²⁸ “... ein Werk des genialen Scharfblicks und der seinen Seelenkunde des Heiden-missionars und aus dessen Erfahrungen herausgeboren,” Weber, *Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*, 44[360].

¹²⁹ Friedrich Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Hellenismus* (FRLANT 5/22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 113–26.

toward sinners were widely praised attributes in Second Temple Judaism.¹³⁰ He then exclaims, “What subject has surely enjoyed such a dissemination as the antithesis between the children of God and the godless!”¹³¹ Concerning the potter and clay metaphor, besides noting that God is not in Wisdom, as in Romans, compared to a potter, Focke challenges the distinctiveness of their shared idea that the potter makes vessels for contrasting uses from the same clay, citing Philo, *Contempl.* 7. Terminologically, Focke, for example, finds the lexical similarities between Rom 9:19b and Wis 12:12b reflected in numerous texts, including Job 9:19b; 41:2b; Ps 76(75):8b; Jer 50(27):44; Nah 1:6b.¹³² They are thus far from decisive. As for Grafe’s concluding contextual argument, Focke observes that three chapters lie between Wis 12:12 and 15:7, two texts which, sharing little in common, would not naturally be associated with one another. When this fact and the contextual *differences* between Rom 9:19–23 and Wis 12:12ff. are kept in mind, Grafe’s concluding argument is, for Focke, dashed to pieces.

In discussing Grafe’s second “Decisive Relation,” the assessment of Gentile idolatry, Focke incorporates Norden into his critique. Focke’s primary criticism is

¹³⁰ Focke (*Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 114) cites Wilhelm Bousset’s (*Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* [2d ed.; Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1906], 438ff.) collection of texts to substantiate this claim.

¹³¹ “Welches Motiv hat sich wohl einer solchen Verbreitung erfreut wie die Antithese zwischen den Kindern Gottes und den Gottlosen!” Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 115.

¹³² The textual parallels in question are as follows:

Rom 9:19b:	τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν;
Wis 12:12b:	ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου;
Job 9:19b:	τίς οὖν κρίματι αὐτοῦ ἀντιστήσεται;
Job 41:2b:	τίς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀντιστάς;
Ps 76(75):8b:	καὶ τίς ἀντιστήσεται σοὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἡ ὀργή σου;
Jer 50(27):44:	τίς ὥσπερ ἐγὼ καὶ τίς ἀντιστήσεται μοι
Nah 1:6b:	καὶ τίς ἀντιστήσεται ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ;

methodological. Although Norden's principle of comparing whole passages with one another, rather than individual words, is often sound, it is invalid in this case because the similarities between Rom 1:18ff. and Wis 12:27ff. are due to a shared background in Hellenistic Jewish-Christian apologetic. In relation to Paul, Focke later observes, "The make-up of the tradition is for him only a skeleton, which owes its flesh and blood principally to the powerful vividness displayed by his preaching in this passage."¹³³ Turning to Grafe, Focke details three criticisms. First, Paul "does not," as Wisdom does, "distinguish the idolaters of the elements and stars from the image-worshippers and allow the former to be granted a milder assessment."¹³⁴ Second, Paul also differentiates himself from Wisdom in the idea that "humans dethroned the true God with conscious intent and set idols in his place" (cf. Rom 1:21–23).¹³⁵ This is because Wisdom speaks not about the "arrogant conceit of the obstinate," but only of ignorant idolaters (cf. Wis 13:1–9).¹³⁶ Third, there is nothing conspicuous in the fact that Paul and Wisdom focus on the immoral consequences of idolatry, as this association would have been self-evident among Hellenistic Jews and Christians. Specifically, Focke disputes the presence of the notion that "like is punished by like" in both authors. In Paul, the word-play in Rom 1:28

¹³³ "Das Gefüge der Tradition ist für ihn nur ein Skelett, das erst der kraftvollen Eindringlichkeit, die seine Predigt an dieser Stelle auszeichnet, Fleisch und Blut verdankt," Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 123.

¹³⁴ "Er [Paul] unterscheidet nicht ... die Vergötterer der Elemente und Gestirne von den Bildernbeten und läßt jenen eine mildere Beurteilung zuteil werden," Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 122. Cf. pp. 122–23, n. 1 for Focke's arguments against Grafe's interpretation of Gal 4:8–10.

¹³⁵ "... [daß] die Menschen den wahren Gott in bewußter Absicht entthronten und die Götzen an seine Stelle setzen," Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 121.

¹³⁶ "[H]ochmütigen Dünkel der Verstockten," Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 121–22.

only faintly reflects this idea and the connection with the twice used μετήλλαξαν (“they exchanged”; Rom 1:25, 26) is likewise superficial. In Wisdom, this retaliatory principle, while clearly articulated, is not related to the immoral consequences of idolatry, in general, but to punishment of the Egyptians, in particular (cf. Wis 11:15–16; 12:27 vs. Wis 14:22ff.). Finally, Focke also voices a criticism, which, as we have seen, Grafe anticipated (cf. p. 79 above), namely that the vice lists of Rom 1:29–31 and Wis 14:23–27 agree in only two members. He further disputes Grafe’s attempt to set the vice list of Romans within the larger framework of 1:24–32 in order to associate it with sexual sin. Focke, however, does not mention Grafe’s explanation for the lack of agreement between the vice lists: the mediatorial role of Paul’s memory. I shall return to this important assumption shortly.

Before discussing Focke’s brief critique of Grafe’s third “Decisive Relation,” the connection between the body and soul (2 Cor 5:1, 4; Wis 9:15), which brings his appendix to an abrupt conclusion, it should be observed that Focke’s three criticisms of the second decisive relation parallel precisely the first three of Weber (cf. p. 90 above). This is all the more noteworthy because the two analyses are independent of one another. As for his view of the body-soul argument, Focke simply dismisses it because similar notions are found in the magical papyri.¹³⁷ Paul, in other words, likely borrowed the idea of the body as a burden from the conceptual world of his time, not from Wisdom.

¹³⁷ Focke (*Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 126) cites Richard Reitzenstein (*Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen: Ihre Grundgedanken und Wirkungen: Vortrag gehalten in dem Wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein für Elsass-Lothringen den 11. November 1909* [Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910], 136) in this regard.

Otto Michel (1929). With a section devoted to Paul's relationship to Wisdom in Otto Michel's 1929 book *Paul and His Bible*, the formation of the literary independence fissure comes to a close.¹³⁸ After quickly reviewing the history of scholarship, Michel credits Focke with conclusively proving that "the contacts between Paul and Wisdom are merely formal in nature and can themselves be explained through the common Hellenistic mother-soil of Jewish-Christian apologetic."¹³⁹ As a consequence of Focke's critique, Michel further suggests, the long-debated question of whether Paul knew Wisdom loses its significance and the focus of scholarship should shift to studying the shared tradition upon which both authors depended.¹⁴⁰

Following this suggestion, Michel briefly compares Rom 1:18–31 to Wis 13:1ff. He identifies two similarities and two differences. The similarities are that both Paul and Wisdom combat Gentile idolatry, a typical *topos*, and also import into this idolatrous context the idea of natural revelation, specifically the notion that the creator is discernible from his works. This, however, is where the authors diverge. Echoing the second criticism of Weber and Focke, Michel observes:

¹³⁸ Otto Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (BFCT 2/18; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929), 11, 14–18; repr. idem, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 11, 14–18. Scholars who subsequently follow Michel include: Johannes Fichtner, *Weisheit Salomos* (HAT 6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938), 9; Joseph Bonsirven, *Exégèse Rabbiniqne et Exégèse Paulinienne* (Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique; Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1939), 291; and Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 77–80.

¹³⁹ "... [daß] die Berührungen zwischen Paulus und der Sapientia lediglich formaler Natur sind und sich durch den gemeinsamen hellenistischen Mutterboden der jüdisch-christlichen Apologetik erklären lassen," Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel*, 16.

¹⁴⁰ Michel (*Paulus und seine Bibel*, 16) is critical of Focke's skeptical stance toward Source-Criticism in relation to Rom 1:18–32 and Wisdom, since Focke himself states that the skeleton of Paul's argument comes from tradition (cf. p. 94 above).

According to Paul the Gentiles recognized this primeval revelation but nevertheless sunk back into idolatry (Rom 1:20, 21a). The thought in Wisdom [is] different. According to it, the Gentiles are people who in the search for God stopped at the worship of creation and were not able to perceive the creator behind the creation (Wis 13:1ff).¹⁴¹

Additionally, Michel argues that Paul and Wisdom differ in their analyses of idolatry.

Paul depicts a three-stage process of moral decline: (1) Idolatry [Rom 1:23]; (2) Creation-worship [Rom 1:25]; and (3) Religious dullness [Rom 1:28]. Wisdom, in contrast, judges creation-worship mildly, even if it fluctuates in its assessment (Wis 13:1–9), but bluntly rejects idolatry (Wis 13:10–19) and theriolatry (Wis 12:24), only the first stage of apostasy for Paul.

Michel's concluding comparison between Rom 1:18–31 and Wis 13:1ff. is certainly not compelling for its depth of insight. His first difference repeats a prior observation and in his second one he idiosyncratically identifies Rom 1:25 with creation-worship, as opposed to the way it is typically (and rightly) read: a recapitulation of the idolatry depicted in Rom 1:23.¹⁴² Rather, what is significant about Michel's comparison is that it anticipates the subsequent direction of scholarship: comparative analysis. In that sense, he is an important transitional figure.

¹⁴¹ “Nach Paulus haben die Heiden diese Uroffenbarung erkannt, sind aber trotzdem in den Götzendienst zurückgesunken (Röm. 1, 20; 21 a). Anders der Gedanke in der Sapientia. Nach ihr sind die Heiden Menschen, die auf der Suche nach Gott bei der Verehrung der Geschöpfe stehen blieben und nicht hinter den Geschöpfen den Schöpfer zu erkennen vermochten (Sap. 13, 1ff.),” Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel*, 17. Michel (ibid.) further observes that Paul “spielt etwas nach der jüdisch-rabbinischen Anschauung hinüber, daß die Heiden bewußt die Thora verworfen haben.” This claim, however, is disputed by Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 79, n. 2.

¹⁴² E.g. Cranfield (*Epistle to the Romans*, 1.123, emphasis his) notes: “μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει repeats the general sense of v. 23, μετήλλαξαν corresponding to ἥλλαξαν, τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ to τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἐν τῷ ψεύδει to ἐν ὁμοιώματι, κ.τ.λ.”

Comparative Analysis

Paul-Gerhard Kyser (1971). The first scholar to engage in extensive comparative analysis of Paul and Wisdom was Paul-Gerhard Keyser in an unpublished dissertation, “Wisdom of Solomon and Paul: An Analysis of Wisdom of Solomon and a Comparison of Its Theological and Anthropological Problems with Those of Paul in Romans,” completed in 1971.¹⁴³ Keyser begins his dissertation with a brief historical review of Paul’s relationship to Wisdom. This review concludes with Michel. Keyser notes that Michel’s emphasis on studying the apologetic tradition common to Paul and Wisdom had become so influential that the question of literary dependency was no longer extensively discussed. Keyser then proposes to pursue a new path. He does this by comparing the theological and anthropological problems and answers common to Paul, especially in Rom 1–3; 9–11, and Wisdom. Four shared characteristics allow for this comparison. First, both authors treat humanity as a whole subdivided from a Jewish standpoint. Wisdom divides humanity into the righteous and godless, while Paul divides humanity into Jews and Gentiles. Second, both authors then reflect on God’s relationship with their two groups, considered individually and collectively. Third, Paul and Wisdom speak of the same God. Fourth, both authors interpret the Jewish scriptures in the Greek language.

¹⁴³ Paul-Gerhard Keyser, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus. Eine Analyse der Sapientia Salomonis und ein Vergleich ihrer theologischen und anthropologischen Probleme mit denen des Paulus im Römerbrief” (Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1971), 2 vols (vol. 1, pp. 1–235: text; vol. 2, pp. 236–325: endnotes). Cf. also idem, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus,” *TLZ* 98 (1973): 951–52; Nikolaus Walter, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus: Bericht über eine Hallenser Dissertation von Paul-Gerhard Keyser aus dem Jahre 1971,” in *Die Weisheit Salomos im Horizont Biblischer Theologie: Mit Beiträgen von Hans Hübner, Lothar Ruppert und Nikolaus Walter* (ed. Hans Hübner; Biblisch-Theologische Studien 22; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993), 83–108.

Following his introduction, Keyser's work is composed of two main parts and a conclusion. In part one, Keyser analyzes the structure and character of Wisdom.¹⁴⁴ He notes, for example, that the seven historical comparisons of Wis 11:2–14; 16:1–19:22 depict God as acting in nature in one and the same situation or through one and the same means but with different effects. His actions are to the advantage of the righteous and to the disadvantage of the wicked, though both groups recognize God through them. The one exception to this pattern is the sixth historical comparison (Wis 18:5–25), in which not nature as an agent, but the *logos* of God as a genuine hypostasis leaps down from heaven to war against the Egyptians (Wis 18:15–16) and acts through the High Priest to subdue death for Israel (Wis 18:22).¹⁴⁵

In part two, Keyser engages in the theological and anthropological comparison proper.¹⁴⁶ He does so under eight headings. They are as follows:

- A. The Universal Aspect
- B. The Righteous
- C. The Godless
- D. The Advantages or Election of Israel
- E. The Decimation of Israel
- F. Rejection
- G. The Problem of God's Righteousness
- H. Compassion

Headings A–C deal with humanity before God, while D–H concern God's acts in history.

In comparison A, Keyser concludes that both Paul and Wisdom believe that the God of Israel is responsible for all men. Where they differ, however, is in their understandings of

¹⁴⁴ Keyser, "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus," 7–125.

¹⁴⁵ Keyser, "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus," 99–105.

¹⁴⁶ Keyser, "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus," 126–228.

the elect and non-elect, the subject of comparisons B and C. In comparison D, Keyser argues that the advantages of Israel which Paul identifies in Rom 9:4–5 (Sonship, Glory, Covenant, Legislation, Cult, Promises, and the Fathers) are all present, at least conceptually, in Wisdom as well. These advantages, in turn, are the starting-point for the remaining comparative headings (E–H), which concern questions about God’s actions in history: Does God decimate his chosen people? Is the implication of Israel’s election the rejection of other peoples? How, then, is God righteous and for whom is his mercy valid? Answering all of these questions leads Keyser to suggest that “Wisdom, in an uncritical manner opposite the people [Israel], seeks to restrict God to the Righteous – Godless contrast, while Paul, stressing the sovereignty of the divine will, explains summarily that God has shut up all to disobedience in order to show mercy to all.”¹⁴⁷

In his conclusion, Keyser reflects on the implications of his study for the understanding of Wisdom.¹⁴⁸ Comparison with Paul highlights the pluralistic, missional, apologetic, and Jewish aspects of Wisdom. In the pluralistic aspect, for example, Keyser notes that Wisdom incorporates diverse theological and anthropological notions without necessarily trying to achieve a systematic balance, such as the view in chapters 6–9 that humanity is mortal by virtue of its Adamic origin in contrast to the view in chapters 1–5 that death entered creation through the devil’s envy (Wis 2:24). Lastly, Keyser considers Wisdom’s role as an intertestamental writing. On the one hand, Wisdom’s universalism,

¹⁴⁷ “...[daß,] die Sap in einer dem Volk gegenüber unkritischen Weise Gott auf den Gegensatz Gerechte – Gottlose festzulegen sucht, während Paulus die Souveränität des göttlichen Willens betonend, zusammenfassend erklärt, daß Gott alle in den Ungehorsam hineingeschlossen habe, um an allen Barmherzigkeit zu erweisen,” Keyser, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus,” 952 (*TLZ* article). Cf. also idem, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus,” 226–28 (unpublished dissertation).

¹⁴⁸ Keyser, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus,” 229–35.

individualism, and doctrine of the after-life all reflect development of OT thought. On the other hand, Wisdom's lack of openness to a new act of God, its insufficient grasp of divine sovereignty, especially in comparison with Paul, and its failure to emphasize the mediatorial role of God's word mean that this writing "stands between the Testaments, not on the way to the New."¹⁴⁹

Beverly R. Gaventa (1987). Such a pejorative characterization of Wisdom is precisely what Beverly Roberts Gaventa wished to avoid in her 1987 essay, "The Rhetoric of Death in the Wisdom of Solomon and the Letters of Paul."¹⁵⁰ Although independently of Keyser's study, Gaventa employs the same methodology in an attempt to respond to E. P. Sanders' critique that most comparisons between Paul and Judaism are either reductionistic examinations of "essences" or studies of common motifs without taking proper account of the differing functions of those motifs.¹⁵¹ Gaventa aims to compare the topic of death in Paul and Wisdom with particular attention to the function of death in each author. Citing Peter Berger, Gaventa contends that death is no mere motif but an existential reality with which any religious system must deal. The conclusion to which she comes is that Paul and Wisdom share four similarities concerning the topic of death:

¹⁴⁹ "...ist sie [Sapientia Salomonis] zwischen den Testamenten stehend nicht auf dem Wege zum Neuen," Keyser, "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus," 235.

¹⁵⁰ Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "The Rhetoric of Death in the Wisdom of Solomon and the Letters of Paul," in *The Listening Heart: Essays in Wisdom and the Psalms in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm.* (ed. Kenneth G. Hoglund, et al.; JSOTSup 58; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987), 127–45.

¹⁵¹ Gaventa ("Rhetoric of Death," 130) critiques Sanders's proposal that patterns of religion should be the object of comparison because "we never have before us an entire religion ... and if we did, we do not have the method that would allow us to compare them...."

Both contrast the fate of the faithful after death with that of unbelievers, although this issue has more importance in Wisdom than in Paul. Both assert God's power over death itself and locate immortality in the power of God.... In both places we find the claim that death and sin are connected with one another. Finally, both contrast reality with appearance, insisting that only the righteous know God's mystery (Wis 2.22; 1 Cor 2.7).¹⁵²

As for differences, the basic one is that Paul operates from an apocalyptic perspective while Wisdom operates from a wisdom perspective. This contrast in orientation gives rise to three particular differences: Wisdom addresses death from the context of theodicy, whereas Paul does so in light of the new event of the gospel; for Paul death is a critical issue because the present age is passing away (Rom 13:11; 1 Cor 7:31), whereas Wisdom expects the world to continue as is; and, finally, Wisdom's reflections are philosophical while Paul's are mythological (1 Cor 15).

Joseph R. Dodson (2008). The third representative of comparative analysis is Joseph R. Dodson, who compares the use of personification in Romans and Wisdom in his 2008 monograph *The 'Powers of Personification'*.¹⁵³ Following an introduction in which Dodson discusses his theme and method, his work is composed of four sections. Section one focuses on personification, in general, devoting two chapters to this trope. Section two then examines the personifications in Wisdom, including Death, Creation, Logos, Wrath, and Sophia. In section three Dodson treats the personifications of Sin and Death, Law, Grace and Righteousness, and Creation in relation to the Power of the Spirit in Romans. All of this prepares for section four in which Dodson compares the shared personifications of Evil and Creation in Romans and Wisdom as well as the common

¹⁵² Gaventa, "Rhetoric of Death," 139.

¹⁵³ Cf. n. 108 above for bibliographic information.

contexts and purposes for personification. Regarding the personification of Creation, for example, Dodson notes that “The ultimate solution for death and suffering is future reward and retribution *by* Creation in *Wisdom* and future redemption and glory *with* Creation in Romans.”¹⁵⁴ Such differences in the use of particular personifications, however, should not be allowed to obscure the common contexts in and purposes for which Romans and Wisdom employ personification. Dodson concludes:

[B]oth authors primarily employ personification in association with 1) the origin of Sin and Death, 2) the current afflictions of the righteous and of Israel, and 3) the future eschatological resolution. In *Wisdom* and in Romans then, personifications chiefly serve to explain the reason for evil (distancing God from the blame), to encourage the righteous within suffering (diverting attention away from the problem), or to point to the solution for evil and suffering (deferring the resolution to a final day).¹⁵⁵

Problematizing the Paradigm: Inadequacy of Dependence or Independence

It would prove tedious to adjudicate all of the rival claims made by scholars thus far regarding Paul’s relationship, or lack thereof, to Wisdom. It is safe to say that overstatements exist on both sides of the dependence–independence divide. Thus, for example, Grafe clearly exaggerates the volitional component of idolatry in Wisdom (cf. p. 90), while Focke’s opposition to the presence of the idea that “like is punished by like” in both authors is hardly convincing (cf. p. 94). What I wish to question instead is the adequacy of the dominant paradigm, namely “Dependence, Independence, and Comparative Analysis.” Clearly, comparative analysis as a method is unobjectionable. The difficulty resides with dependence or independence. Specifically, there are three

¹⁵⁴ Dodson, *‘Powers’ of Personification*, 221, italics his.

¹⁵⁵ Dodson, *‘Powers’ of Personification*, 221.

problems with conceptualizing the relationship between Romans and Wisdom in this manner. First, it is important to recognize that even the staunchest supporters of literary dependence do not hold that Paul at any point cites Wisdom. Grafe, as we have seen, thinks that dependence is mediated through Paul's memory while Norden regards Paul as paraphrasing Wisdom for his own ends. If one, for the sake of argument, grants the possibility that Paul in Rom 1:18ff. could either be drawing upon Wisdom from his own memory and/or paraphrasing this text, then it proves impossible to distinguish such dependence from shared tradition.

Second, the preceding point is borne out in practice as it is sometimes hard to tell whether a scholar supports literary dependence, shared tradition, or is merely ambiguous about the matter, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Two examples may be cited. One concerns Anders Nygren and Elliot. Although Nygren seems to endorse Pauline dependence when he contends that chapters 11–15 of Wisdom “supply the key to the second chapter of Romans” and that Paul “addresses himself to the Jew's manner of life, as we see it in the Book of Wisdom,”¹⁵⁶ Elliot nonetheless interprets these statements as Nygren demurring “from suggesting any literary relationship between Romans and Wisdom.”¹⁵⁷ The other example concerns Watson and Byrne. Regarding Rom 1:18–2:5, Watson says Byrne “acknowledges that the parallels with *Wisdom* are particularly

¹⁵⁶ Nygren, *Romans*, 114, 116, respectively. Cf. also Nygren's comments on p. 113 regarding the inadequacy of the parallels between Rom 1:18–32 and Wisdom to furnish proof of dependence. Dodson (*'Powers' of Personification*, 7), for example, reads Nygren as supporting Pauline dependence because of the parallels he discusses between Rom 2 and Wisdom.

¹⁵⁷ Elliott, *Rhetoric of Romans*, 176.

striking, but does not assume any direct relationship,”¹⁵⁸ even though Byrne (on a page subsequent to the one cited by Watson), as I noted in chapter one, claims “So close, in fact, are the contacts in language and ideas” between Rom 2:4 and Wis 12:22; 15:1–3 (cf. Wis 16:9–11) “that it is hard to believe that Paul is not writing with Wisdom specifically in mind.”¹⁵⁹

The third problem with conceptualizing the relationship between Romans and Wisdom in terms of dependence or independence (i.e. shared tradition) is that this paradigm does not necessarily distinguish between widely divergent interpretations of Rom 1:18–2:11 in relation to Wisdom. Thorsteinsson, for example, cites parallels to Rom 1:18–32 drawn from Wis 11–15, “a writing which may have been known to Paul,” to prove that “the people described in Romans 1:18–32 belonged to the non-Jewish world” and he later denies that such similarities, viewed in relation to Rom 2:1–4, suggest that the interlocutor whom Paul opposes is a Jew.¹⁶⁰ This reading stands in stark contrast to the subversive interpretation defended by Dunn, Cranfield, and Lincoln, among others (cf. pp. 71ff. above).

Alternate Paradigm: Substantive Endorsement or Subversive Engagement

A more adequate paradigm for conceptualizing the relationship between Romans and Wisdom emerges when one focuses on the use to which the similarities between Rom

¹⁵⁸ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405, n. 78. Watson is referring to a statement made by Byrne, *Romans*, 65.

¹⁵⁹ Byrne, *Romans*, 81. Note that Watson (*Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405, n. 79) also seems to be in error when he categorizes Wilckens (*Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.96–97) as opting for literary dependence rather than shared tradition.

¹⁶⁰ Thorsteinsson, *Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 167–69, 191–94.

1:18–2:11 and Wisdom are put. Does Paul substantively endorse the perspective evinced in Wis 11–19 (esp. 13–15), whether by way of literary dependence or shared tradition, or does he both endorse it, to some degree, and then subversively engage it? One sometimes finds the question of Paul’s relationship to Wisdom posed in this way. Watson, for example, says that “the depth of Paul’s engagement with this text [Wisdom] is evident precisely at the points where he also differs from it.”¹⁶¹ In my view, this alternate paradigm, along with comparative analysis, should become the predominant one. Its patriarch, Hans Lietzmann, as it turns out, is also the one responsible for the now influential subversive reading of Rom 2:4 in relation to Wisdom. In the 1906 edition of his commentary Lietzmann cites Wis 15:1–4 in relation to Rom 2:1 ff. as the text that Paul opposes, even though (or perhaps precisely because) Paul had been following in the footsteps of Wis 13–14 up to that point.¹⁶² This reading was disputed as early as 1914 by Heinrich Daxer and then adopted either independently or without acknowledgment by C. H. Dodd in 1932; and it received further development from Nygren in 1944, again either independently or without acknowledgment.¹⁶³ From that point, this subversive interpretation became widespread (cf. pp. 71ff. above, especially n. 88).

¹⁶¹ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405, n. 77. See also Walter, “Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus,” 104–6.

¹⁶² Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, 8–9, 12. Although Elliott (*Rhetoric of Romans*, 174) rightly credits Lietzmann with originating this reading, Lietzmann’s foundational role in this regard is not otherwise recognized.

¹⁶³ Heinrich Daxer, *Römer 1, 18–2, 10 im Verhältnis zur spätjüdischen Lehrauffassung* (Naumburg a. d. S.: Lippert, 1914), 20–22, 82–83, n. 45.; Dodd, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 26–27, 32–33; Nygren, *Romans*, 112–20 (the first Swedish edition of Nygren’s commentary, *Romarbrevet*, was published by Verbum in Stockholm in 1944).

The benefit of conceptualizing the relationship between Rom 1:18–2:11 and Wisdom as substantive endorsement or subversive engagement, rather than dependence or independence is twofold. First, one does not need to concentrate on whether Paul knew Wisdom, which, as we have seen, is impossible to prove or disprove if the role of memory and paraphrase are allowed. Second, the split between scholars who opt for substantive endorsement and those who opt for subversive engagement, since Lietzmann inaugurated this paradigm, is essentially the same as that between the Gentile and Jewish identifications of the interlocutor, with advocates of the generic judge position falling on either side of the divide.¹⁶⁴ In that sense, this paradigm does more justice to the interpretive issues at stake in the bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11. Although the sketch of the larger context I shall provide in chapter six inclines me to the view that Paul knew Wisdom, all that has to be granted for my thesis is that Paul is subversively engaging an interpretive tradition similar to Wis 13–15.

¹⁶⁴ The following scholars embrace a subversive engagement reading of Rom 1:18–2:11 and Wisdom, whether conceived in terms of literary dependence or shared tradition, and are further subdivided according to their identification of the interlocutor. Jewish identification: Lietzmann, *An die Römer*, 32–39 (1933 edition); Dodd, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 26–27, 32–33; Nygren, *Romans*, 112–20; Bornkamm, *Early Christian Experience*, 50; Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1.104, n. 1, 137–38, 141–45; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 1.96–97, 124; Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 35, 53–54; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 53, 56–57, 62, 65, 78, 82–83, 90–91; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 272, 274, 288, 298, 299, 301; Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification,” 196–206; Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 34–35, 39–40; Byrne, *Romans*, 64–65, 79–82, 84–85; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 97, n. 18, 109, n. 83, 128, 133; Schreiner, *Romans*, 81, 91–92, 103, 109–10; Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting?* 27, 68, 166–68, 199; Wright, “Letter to the Romans,” 428–29, 429, 433, 438–39; Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405–11. Generic judge identification: Barrett, *Epistle to the Romans*, 35–45 (1957 edition) idem, *Epistle to the Romans*, 35–44 (1991 edition); Laato, *Paul and Judaism*, 86–89; Seifrid, “Unrighteous by Faith,” 113–15, 122–23. There are no scholars who adhere to a Gentile identification and a subversive reading.

The following scholars embrace a substantive endorsement reading and are again subdivided according to their identification of the interlocutor. Jewish identification: Grafe, “Verhältniss,” 251–86; Sanday and Headlam, *Commentary*, 51–52, 267–69. Generic judge identification: Leenhardt, *Epistle to the Romans*, 63, n. *, 64, n. *; Elliott, *Rhetoric of Romans*, 108, n. 3, 173–85; Bell, *No One Seeks for God*, 69, 74–77, 82, 88–89, 139, n. 34, 140, n. 36; Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric*, 109–10. Gentile identification: Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 87, 92; Johnson, *Reading Romans*, 31–32; Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans*, 145–48; Thorsteinsson, *Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2*, 167–69, 191–94; Keck, *Romans*, 60–61.

Substructure of Psalm 106(105)

We turn now to scholarly analyses related to my primary proposal that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11. This section consists of two subsections. The first is a selective, as opposed to exhaustive, discussion of pre-critical and critical analyses that anticipate the substructural role I propose for Ps 106(105) and, in one case, even the larger context sketched in chapter six. The second subsection concludes with three analyses that err in drawing attention away from Ps 106(105), thus underscoring the need for the renewed scholarly focus upon the relevance of Ps 106(105) to Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

Anticipatory Analyses

Pre-Critical

Textual Tradition

Prior to the advent of historical criticism, we find initial evidence that scribal interpreters discerned a relationship between Rom 1:23 and Ps 106(105):20 in the textual tradition itself. Significantly, the transmission history of both verses witnesses to this relationship. Beginning with Ps 106(105):20, the influence of Rom 1:23 on its textual tradition emerges at two points. First, in place of the OG aorist middle ἠλλάξαντο (“they changed”), uncial 55 witnesses to the aorist active ἥλλαξαν (“they changed”), a reading that both Alfred Rahlfs and Jannes Smith attribute to the ἥλλαξαν of Rom 1:23.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, instead of the OG τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν (“their glory”), “a few *L* Mss have τὴν

¹⁶⁵ Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Psalmi Cum Odis* (Septuaginta 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 266; Jannes Smith, “A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the Hallelouia Psalms of the Septuagint” (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005), 168.

δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ,” once again likely due to the presence of this phrase in Rom 1:23.¹⁶⁶

Turning to Rom 1:23, the text critical apparatus of NA²⁷ shows that the uncial K and minuscules 6, 630 as well as other manuscripts not listed read ἡλλάξαντο rather than ἡλλάξαν.¹⁶⁷ This reading, as Niels Hyldahl observes, “is to be understood as a further assimilation to the exact words” of Ps 106(105):20.¹⁶⁸

Patristic Period

In the patristic period, two interpreters draw connections between Rom 1:23 and Ps 106(105):20. One is Origen. In his *Selecta in Psalmos* on Ps 106(105):20, he cites the words of Paul from Rom 1:23.¹⁶⁹ The other is Gennadius I of Constantinople. The fragments preserved from his commentary on Romans show that he associated Ps 106(105):20 with Rom 1:23.¹⁷⁰ Thus pre-critical interpreters, whether scribes or church fathers, anticipate, even if only in relation to two verses, my proposal that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

Critical

Leslie C. Allen (1964) and Morna D. Hooker (1966)

We turn now from pre-critical interpreters to the relatively recent work of Leslie C. Allen (1964) and Morna D. Hooker (1966). In addition to stressing allusions to the

¹⁶⁶ Smith, “Linguistic,” 168. See also Rahlfs, *Psalmi Cum Odis*, 266.

¹⁶⁷ See also Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Romans* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 2001), 12.

¹⁶⁸ “A Reminiscence of the Old Testament at Romans i. 23,” *NTS* 2 (1956): 285–88[285, n. 1].

¹⁶⁹ See PG 12, 1565.

¹⁷⁰ See Karl Staab, ed., *Pauluskommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche: Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben* (2d ed.; Münster: Aschendorff, 1984), 358.

Adamic fall,¹⁷¹ both scholars, albeit implicitly, recognize that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Rom 1:18–32. Allen initially does so by recalling—in reference to the quotation “with adaptations” of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23—that “C. H. Dodd has stressed how the quotation of a single verse can reveal the presence of a whole passage in the writer’s mind”; while Hooker, before mentioning the quotation of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23, simply states: “Paul seems to have been influenced ... by the theme and language of Ps. cvi (LXX cv).”¹⁷² Significantly, these two analyses appear to be independent of one another. It is all the more remarkable, then, that, besides the citation of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23, Allen and Hooker agree on three further points.¹⁷³ First, Rom 1:18–32 and Ps 106(105) share a general structure of sin and punishment. Second, Ps 106(105):41a, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ κύριος] εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν, (“[the LORD] gave them over into the hands of the Gentiles”) inspired the thrice-repeated expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28. Third, the giving over “to desires” (ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις) in Rom 1:24 recalls Ps 105(105):14. Although the latter text concerns Israel’s excessive desire in relation to quail (cf. Num 11:4), Ps 106(105):39 does mention Israelite fornication in imitation of Gentiles, a verse that Allen associates

¹⁷¹ Allen (“The Old Testament in Romans I–VIII,” *VE* 3 [1964]: 6–41[15]); Hooker (“Adam in Romans 1,” *NTS* 6 [1960]: 297–306). Allen, in fact, relies on Hooker, though he regards some of her arguments as unconvincing. See chapter five for an extensive discussion of the proposal that Rom 1:18–32 alludes to the Adamic fall.

¹⁷² Allen, “Old Testament in Romans I–VIII,” 29; Morna D. Hooker, “A Further Note on Romans 1,” *NTS* 13 (1966): 183.

¹⁷³ In addition to these three points, Hooker (“Further,” 183) relates the doxology of Rom 1:25 (ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν) to Ps 106(105):48a: Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος.

with the “sexual irregularities” of Rom 1:26–27.¹⁷⁴ Yet, neither Allen nor Hooker consider the relevance of Ps 106(105) to Rom 2:1ff. For this, we must turn to the work of Jouette M. Bassler.

Jouette M. Bassler (1982)

In her 1982 monograph *Divine Impartiality*, Jouette M. Bassler endorses the standard view that “Paul has patterned his argument” in Rom 1:18–32 “according to Jewish polemics against Gentiles,” especially Wisdom; yet she notes, as do others, that “Rom 1:23 contains unambiguous allusions to Jer 2:11 and especially Ps 106:20 (LXX 105:20), texts which speak of Israel’s apostasy and idolatry at the golden calf incident (Exodus 32),” and she even devotes an entire appendix to discussing the allusions in Rom 1:23.¹⁷⁵ These allusions prove important for her interpretation of Rom 2:1. Bassler insists that *δύο* possesses “its full logical force”¹⁷⁶ and she connects the charge of doing the same, aimed at a Jewish interlocutor, to Rom 1:23. Bassler states:

Any Jewish reader, indeed, anyone familiar with Jewish polemics, would recognize the object of the polemic in 1:18–32 as the Gentiles, yet Paul refuses to designate them explicitly as such and instead begins in 1:23 to implicate the Jews. Likewise, even the Jews would recognize themselves behind the description in Chapter 2 of the one who judges immoral actions, especially if they picked up the earlier reference to the calf incident and therefore understood the relevance of the accusation, ‘You do the same things’ (2:1).¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Allen, “Old Testament in Romans I–VIII,” 29. In chapter five, I suggest that Paul has taken the notion of excessive desire from Ps 106(105):14 and transferred it to the sexual arena.

¹⁷⁵ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 122, 195–97, 249, n. 2.

¹⁷⁶ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 131.

¹⁷⁷ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 135.

For our purposes, two points are significant. First, Bassler correctly perceives that the calf allusion in Rom 1:23 plays a part in the rhetorical turn of Rom 2:1ff. Although she does not focus solely on Ps 106(105):20, including Jer 2:11 as well, and mentions only the calf account of Exod 32–34, and not the version found in Deut 9–10, she nonetheless anticipates my proposal the substructural role of Ps 106(105) extends beyond Rom 1:18–32 to include 2:1–11. Second, Bassler properly aligns all four pavement stones which constitute the rhetorical bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11. In that sense, it is not a coincidence that she anticipates my primary proposal regarding Ps 106(105) as the substructure of Rom 1:18–2:11. What Bassler does not anticipate, however, is any aspect of the secondary sketch provided in chapter six. For that we must turn to Francis Watson.

Francis Watson (2004)

In his 2004 *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, Francis Watson comes the closest to anticipating both my primary proposal and secondary sketch. Even if not always explicitly, Watson properly aligns all four pavement stones. An inferential understanding of *διό* is implicit in his interpretation of Rom 1:18–2:5 (stone one).¹⁷⁸ The interlocutor, according to Watson, wrongly “believes himself to have escaped the nexus of human sin and guilt,” including “idolatry, sexual sin, and violence”; in reality, however, he does the same (stone two).¹⁷⁹ There are “good grounds for concluding that Paul has a fellow-Jew in mind” when he addresses this interlocutor (stone three).¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 408–11.

¹⁷⁹ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 408–9.

¹⁸⁰ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 409.

Finally, Watson's subversive engagement reading of Rom 1:18–2:5 in relation to Wis 13:1–15:6 is exemplary (stone four). Noting that “the depth of Paul's engagement” with Wisdom “is evident precisely at points where he also differs from it,”¹⁸¹ Watson, as Lietzmann first suggested in 1906, argues that in Rom 1:18–32 Paul shadows Wis 13–14 only to turn upon Wis 15:1–6 in Rom 2:1–5. As do all advocates of this view, Watson stresses the parallels between Wis 15:1 and Rom 2:4.

Although Watson does not extend his analysis to Rom 2:11, his proper alignment of all four pavement stones leads him to focus on the evocation of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23 as the basis for indicting the Jewish interlocutor of Rom 2:1 and also countering Wis 15:1–6. He states: “Here, Paul faces the fact that the author of *Wisdom* strives to suppress: that the holy nation is itself deeply complicit in the idolatry and ungodliness that it prefers to ascribe to the Gentiles.”¹⁸² The manner in which Watson draws attention to Paul's opposition to Wis 15:1–6 turns out to be the first of three ways he anticipates the larger context sketched in chapter six. The second is that he partially recognizes the evocation of Exod 34:6–7, 9 in Wis 15:1–2. Watson observes that “In the *Wisdom* passage, the appeal to the kindness and patience of God is rooted in Exodus 34.5” and then states, “The fact that Paul attacks the mentality expressed here does not make it ‘unscriptural’ – rather, it is an indication that what is or is not ‘scriptural’ is always contested.”¹⁸³ Unfortunately, Watson does not then connect the contested scriptural

¹⁸¹ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 405, n. 77. Interestingly, the significance of Wis 13–15 for interpreting Rom 1:18–2:5 is entirely absent from idem, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles*, 192–216.

¹⁸² Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 411.

¹⁸³ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 409, n. 84.

ground between Paul and Wisdom to the golden calf incident. Instead, referring to Wisdom, he says, “The earlier author fails to mention the Golden Calf, preferring to maintain the righteousness of the holy people by projecting their unrighteousness onto the Gentiles.”¹⁸⁴ In that sense, Watson fails to see that the role of Exod 34:5ff. in Wisdom is not that of a biblical allusion disconnected from the golden calf incident of which it is a part, but is instead, as I shall suggest, an implicit interpretation of this very event, one to which Paul responds by evoking Deut 9:1–10:22 in Rom 2:5–11.

The third and final way in which Watson anticipates the secondary sketch provided in chapter six occurs when he compares Paul’s treatment of Exod 14–17 and Num 11–21, as reflected in Rom 7 and 1 Cor 10, to the treatment of these same texts in Wis 11–19. Whereas Wis 11–19 emphasizes God’s saving goodness to Israel in both Exod 14–17 and Num 11–21, Paul associates salvation with the former text and judgment with the latter, with the coming of the Law serving as the dividing line (cf. Rom 7:9).¹⁸⁵ Finding a precedent for these two differing approaches in Pss 105(104)–106(105), Watson states: “The author of *Wisdom* stands closer to Psalm 105, Paul to Psalm 106: but there is – arguably – no reason why the two later interpretations should not peacefully coexist and indeed complement one another, just as the two earlier ones do.”¹⁸⁶ Watson is right to associate Paul with Ps 106(105) and Wis 11–19 with Ps 105(104). His insight in this regard, however, falls short in several respects. It is not subsequently related to

¹⁸⁴ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 411.

¹⁸⁵ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 383.

¹⁸⁶ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 384.

Paul's subversive dialogue with Wisdom in Rom 1:18–2:11, one in which, as we have seen, Watson himself places particular emphasis on the evocation of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23. Watson also fails to explore further the degree of similarity and difference between Pss 105(104)–106(105) and Wis 11–19. Specifically, he does not observe that four of the first five contrasts of Wis 11–19 can be constructed from Ps 105(104) and that there are five antithetical parallels between Wis 11–19 and Ps 106(105). Lastly, Watson's attempt to pacify the rival stances toward the Pentateuch in Paul and Wis 11–19 by means of Pss 105(104)–106(105) may have caused him to gloss over evidence for a preexisting intra-Jewish dispute, one that Paul exploited for his own purposes.

Errant Analyses

John R. Levison (2004)

Having discussed approximations, whether pre-critical or critical, of my primary proposal and even elements of the associated secondary sketch, we turn now to examine three scholars whose work errs in drawing attention away from the substructural role of Ps 106(105) in Rom 1:18–2:11. The first is John R. Levison. Although he acknowledges the allusion to Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23, Levison argues that Rom 1:23 also reflects the influence of Gen 1:20–26 and Gen 3:1–7, especially once the interpretive developments in the *Apocalypse of Moses*, or Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* (the designation Levison prefers) are taken into account.¹⁸⁷ In light of these developments, Rom 1:23 concerns the “exchange” (ἀλλάσσω) of God's glory for mortality and Rom 1:25 then follows with the “exchange” (μεταλλάσσω) of natural dominion for unnatural

¹⁸⁷ John R. Levison, “Adam and Eve in Romans 1.18–25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*,” *NTS* 50 (2004): 519–34.

subservience to animals. In support of the latter exchange, Levison points to the use of μεταλλάσσω in *GLAE* 11.2.

Since chapter five includes an extended discussion of the biblical texts related to Rom 1:23 and also expands upon and critiques Levison's proposal regarding the Greek *Life*, here I wish to focus on two important matters he fails to consider in relation to Ps 106(105). First, Levison fails to consider the possibility that Paul adopts the verb μεταλλάσσω in Rom 1:25 and 26b (which Levison does not mention) simply because he is depicting "exchanges" subsequent to and following from the initial idolatrous ἀλάσσω ("change") of glory in Rom 1:23, language which, by Levison's own admission, derives from Ps 106(105):20. Second, although he refers to Hooker's 1966 article,¹⁸⁸ Levison fails to consider the possibility that the thrice-repeated expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός ("God gave them over") in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28 was inspired by Ps 106(105):41a, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ κύριος] εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν, ("[the LORD] gave them over into the hands of the Gentiles"). These two failures are not unrelated. Had Levison considered and endorsed the latter possibility, then he would have been more inclined, perhaps obligated, to consider the former possibility. Levison would then have had to provide reasons why the "(ex)change" pattern could not have come from Ps 106(105) as well. In the end, Levison draws attention away from the relevance of Ps 106(105) by what he fails to consider.

¹⁸⁸ Levison, "Greek *Life*," 523, n. 16.

Beverly R. Gaventa (2005)

In a 2005 article entitled “God Handed Them Over,” Beverly R. Gaventa also fails to consider the relevance of Ps 106(105) to Paul’s argument in Rom 1:18–2:11.¹⁸⁹ In her article, Gaventa provides an apocalyptic interpretation of the phrase παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28. Her argument proceeds in three stages. First, Gaventa focuses upon usage in the LXX (e.g. Mic 6:16; Ps 118[117]:18) and in Paul (esp. 1 Cor 5:5) which shows that “παραδίδωμι [“give over”] can refer to the surrendering of someone or something in a context of conflict.”¹⁹⁰ This lexical usage leads Gaventa in the second stage of her argument to consider that to which God gave over humanity. She observes that “All three instances of παρέδωκεν are followed by phrases consisting of εἰς plus an accusative noun”.¹⁹¹

Table 4. Rom 1:24, 26a, 28

²⁴ Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ... εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν....	²⁴ Therefore God gave them over <u>to</u> impurity....
^{26a} Διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας....	^{26a} On account of this, God gave them over <u>to</u> passions of dishonor....
²⁸ ... παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν....	²⁸ ... God gave them over <u>to</u> an unfit mind....

¹⁸⁹ Beverly Roberts Gaventa, “God Handed Them Over: Reading Romans 1:18–32 Apocalyptically,” *ABR* 53 (2005): 42–53; repr. in idem, *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010), 113–23, 194–97. Gaventa’s view has been adopted by Jonathan A. Linebaugh, “Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11,” *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–37[233–35].

¹⁹⁰ Gaventa, “God Handed Them Over,” 47; idem, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 117. The definition in brackets is mine.

¹⁹¹ Gaventa, “God Handed Them Over,” 48; idem, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 118. The next two quotations come from these same two pages.

Gaventa concedes that the first instance in Rom 1:24 is followed immediately by ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν (“to the desires of their hearts”), which “is often translated and interpreted as if it were the object to which humanity was handed over,” yet she argues that the ἐν phrase here should instead be understood causally. When this is done, “then the three εἰς clauses may be regarded as identifying the agent(s) to whom humanity is handed: ἀκαθαρσία/uncleanness or impurity, πάθος ἀτιμίας/dishonorable passions, and ἀδόκιμος νοῦς/deformed mind.” Gaventa further argues that in light of parallels in Rom 6:19, 7:5, and 8:6–7:

All of these expressions ... have in view the enslavement of humanity to agents that are set over against God. Uncleanness, dishonourable passions and deformed mind are instances of synecdoche; they refer to the anti-god powers, most especially the power of Sin. Because of human refusal to recognize God, God turns humanity over—concedes humanity for a time—to another power, the power of Sin.¹⁹²

In the third stage of her argument, Gaventa considers the implications of this reading of Rom 1:24, 26a, 28. She notes two. One is that it leads to a consistent construal of sin as a power, as opposed to the standard interpretation which distinguishes between sin as transgression in Rom 1–3 and sin as an external force in Rom 5–7. The second implication is that this reading highlights the apocalyptic character of Romans.

Turning from exposition to analysis, there are two difficulties with Gaventa’s apocalyptic interpretation of παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28. The first is that it is internally problematic. In order to achieve her “anti-god powers” reading, she must assign a causal sense to ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν in Rom 1:24. Yet,

¹⁹² Gaventa, “God Handed Them Over,” 49; idem, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 119. The different spellings of “dishono(u)rable” in this quotation and the one that precedes are in the original.

assigning a causal sense here conflicts with the syntax of the passage. The inferential Διό at the beginning of Rom 1:24 shows that the causal ground for the first giving-over is provided in the “change” of Rom 1:22–23, not what immediately follows the παρέδωκεν expression in Rom 1:24. The ἐν phrase, then, should be interpreted as the desires to which humanity is handed over because of the prior idolatrous “change.” Moreover, attributing a forensic sense to παραδίδωμι, as opposed to an apocalyptic one, adequately accounts for the kind of usage in the LXX and in Paul that Gaventa discusses. Indeed, as Gaventa herself notes, the closely related rhetorical turn of Rom 2:1 employs the verb κατακρίνω (“condemn”), which supports a forensic sense.

The second difficulty, most notable for our purposes, is that Gaventa nowhere mentions the possibility that παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28 derives from Ps 106(105):41a, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ κύριος] εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν, (“[the LORD] gave them over into the hands of the Gentiles”), even though the latter verse refers to surrender in the context of conflict and, as we have seen, was already discussed in the work of Allen and Hooker. Neither, it should be added, does Gaventa discuss the interplay with (μετ)αλλάσσω in Rom 1:23, 26b, 28, the first instance of which derives from Ps 106(105):20. That Gaventa could devote an entire article to παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός without mentioning Ps 106(105) shows the need for renewed awareness of the relevance of this psalm to Paul’s argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11.

Douglas A. Campbell (2009)

This scholarly tendency to neglect the relevance of Ps 106(105) to Rom 1:18–2:11 continues in Douglas A. Campbell’s 2009 *The Deliverance of God*, the final work I shall

discuss.¹⁹³ With particular attention to Rom 1–4, Campbell relentlessly attacks what he calls “The Justification Theory of Salvation” for, among other things, its problematic focus on penal substitution and a contractual understanding of human faith. In place of this theory, Campbell proposes an apocalyptic construal of justification that emphasizes God’s unconditional deliverance.¹⁹⁴ In the course of making this proposal, Campbell argues that Rom 1:18–3:20 is “a tightly focused, contingent discussion” in which Paul reduces to absurdity the alternative gospel of a person whom Campbell designates the “Teacher” (cf. Rom 16:17–20).¹⁹⁵ Viewed in this light, Rom 1:18–32 represents speech-in-character; it is, in other words, the Teacher’s own rhetorical opening with affinities to Wis 11–16. In Rom 2:1–8 Paul begins to respond to the Teacher, though he continues to make use of ironic quotation.¹⁹⁶ What Paul does in Rom 2:1–8 is make explicit the Teacher’s principle of soteriological desert, or judgment according to works, and he universalizes that principle. Rom 2:9–29 then details the awkward implications of universalizing this principle, such as the possibility of Jewish sinners and pagan saints. Finally, Rom 3:1–20 drives toward the humiliating conclusion that no person can be

¹⁹³ Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

¹⁹⁴ For initial reactions to Campbell’s work, see, for example, Beverly Roberts Gaventa, “Rescue Mission,” *Christian Century* 127, no. 10 (18 May 2010): 36–37; Douglas J. Moo, “Review Article: *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* by Douglas A. Campbell,” *JETS* 53 (2010): 143–50; Francis Watson, “Review of Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*,” *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 179–85.

¹⁹⁵ See Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 519–600.

¹⁹⁶ Campbell (*Deliverance of God*, 587–90) repunctuates a slightly altered version of the NRSV of Rom 1:16–3:20 so that what he attributes to the Teacher is placed in italics.

justified by works of the Law. The Teacher's gospel, as Campbell puts it, "saves no one, not even its proclaimer!"¹⁹⁷

It is beyond the scope of the present project to respond in detail to Campbell's provocative reading of Rom 1:18–3:20, much less to his assault on Justification Theory. And, indeed, doing so would require a far more extensive summary of Campbell's work than is provided in the preceding paragraph. With these limitations in mind, I nonetheless wish to register three criticisms, with the last being the most important for our purposes. First, Beverly R. Gaventa, who is favorably disposed to Campbell's apocalyptic rereading of Paul, rightly questions the manner in which Campbell distinguishes between material attributed to Paul himself and to the Teacher, or Teachers. She states:

Even if we grant Campbell his scenario [that the Letter to the Romans is a preemptive strike against Jewish Christian missionaries], how were the Romans, to most of whom Paul was unknown, to identify which lines were the Teachers' and which were Paul's? Of course, there are brief passages in which Paul anticipates an objection (as in 6:1 and 6:15), and it is surely correct that the congregations gathered to hear Phoebe would have been adept at decoding verbal signals and conventional rhetorical gestures. Yet the confidence with which Campbell divides the Teachers' lines from those of Paul can strain even the most sympathetic reader.¹⁹⁸

Second, Campbell's identification of Rom 2:1–8 and 2:9–29 as separate stages in Paul's argument cuts across a widely recognized chiasm, whether that chiasm is regarded as comprising Rom 2:7–9, or more expansively Rom 2:6–11.¹⁹⁹ His division here, in other words, is suspect. Third, and most important, Campbell dismisses, without

¹⁹⁷ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 593.

¹⁹⁸ Gaventa, "Rescue Mission," 36, material in brackets mine.

¹⁹⁹ See the structural analysis of Rom 2:6–11 in chapter five.

argumentation, the possibility that Ps 106(105) has influenced Rom 1:18–2:11. His only substantive reference to this psalm is in an endnote. Having cited the Greek text of Rom 1:23 in the body of his own text, Campbell states: “Paul has definitely borrowed this language from certain Old Testament texts, but I am not convinced that intertextuality plays any broader role in the argument at this point. Certainly, I cannot see where any such implications are explicitly activated.”²⁰⁰ Campbell then refers to Ps 106(105), especially v. 20, among other passages.

Campbell may be correct that the intertextual implications of Ps 106(105) are not explicitly activated at any point in Rom 1:18–2:11. The question, however, is whether the intertextual implications of this psalm are implicitly activated throughout. The primary burden of this dissertation is to argue that they are to such an extent that constitutively as well as rhetorically, through ironic, inferential, and indirect application, Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Paul’s argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11. If this thesis proves convincing, then it underscores the underlying continuity between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11, providing yet another challenge to Campbell’s claim that the former text, through the device of speech-in-character, represents the Teacher’s rhetorical opening, while the latter includes Paul’s initial response. At the very least, the degree to which Levison, Gaventa, and Campbell err in calling attention away from Ps 106(105) shows that my proposal regarding its substructural role, building on the insights of interpreters both pre-

²⁰⁰ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 1082, n. 63. See also (ibid., 1059, n. 133), where Campbell, in reference to Rom 1:18–32, says: “Stowers strongly repudiates any echoes of either the fall and Genesis 1–3, or later Israelite texts or allusions such as Psalm 106 and/or the incident of the golden calf.”

critical and critical, is a timely reminder of the relevance of this psalm to Paul's argumentation.

Conclusion

The first section of this chapter engaged in a lengthy consideration of the four interlocking pavement stones I have identified as constituting the rhetorical bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11. These pavement stones are: (1) A Problematic Particle, *διό*; (2) An Uncertain Similarity, the referents of *τὰ αὐτά* [“the same things”] and *τὰ τοιαῦτα* [“such things”] in Rom 2:1–3; (3) An Unidentified Interlocutor, whether Jew, Gentile, or generic judge; and (4) A Possible Dialogue Partner in Wisdom, whether substantively endorsed or subversively engaged. The proper alignment of these four pavement stones, I contend, points to the substructural role of Ps 106(105) throughout Rom 1:18–32. Thus the second section of this chapter discussed scholarly analyses, whether anticipatory or errant, related to my primary proposal regarding Ps 106(105) and even, in the case of Francis Watson, related to my secondary suggestion that Paul's decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) reflects his participation in and even exploitation of a preexisting intra-Jewish dispute. In the next chapter, I discuss the methodological approach of this study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGICAL MATTERS

Introduction

Before discussing Ps 106(105) and Rom 1:18–2:11 as well as the manner in which Paul’s employment of the former text in the construction of the latter may reflect his participation in a conversation about Jewish identity, we need to consider two preliminary, though important, matters. The first is the hermeneutical approach to this architectural analysis and the second is the literary and linguistic atmosphere of Paul’s argument. As will become apparent, both are essential to establishing the historical feasibility of my proposal. This chapter is accordingly divided into two sections corresponding to these concerns. We begin with hermeneutical methodology.

Hermeneutical Approach

Pausing to focus on hermeneutical methodology is especially appropriate given that Samuel Sandmel’s influential notion of *parallelomania*, that “extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction,” derives from a critique of the claim that Paul generously copied from Wisdom as he wrote Romans.¹ What has already been said regarding the impossibility of distinguishing between Pauline literary dependence on Wisdom and

¹ Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13[1].

shared tradition, assuming quotation from memory and/or paraphrase, should be sufficient to allay any concerns that this study has succumbed to parallelomania. Nonetheless, it is important to give a positive presentation of the hermeneutical approach employed in this dissertation.

Building upon Metaleptic Allusion and Complex Conversation

Although indebted to C. H. Dodd's influential *According to the Scriptures* for the architectural metaphor of substructure,² the hermeneutical approach employed in this study builds directly upon the work of two subsequent scholars. The first is Richard B. Hays in his 1989 *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* and in a later essay, "'Who Has Believed Our Message?' Paul's Reading of Isaiah," initially published in 1998.³ The second is Francis Watson in his 2004 *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, itself influenced by Hays.⁴ Included in this discussion of Hays and Watson will be a critical, though appreciative, response to the objections of Christopher D. Stanley concerning the importance of the original audience and other ancient realities.⁵

² C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952). On the architectural metaphor at the heart of Dodd's book, see especially p. 13.

³ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University, 1989); idem, "'Who Has Believed Our Message?' Paul's Reading of Isaiah," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 37.1; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998), 205–25; reprinted in John M. Court, ed., *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2002), 46–70 and Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 25–49. References to "'Who Has Believed Our Message?'" are to the 2005 version.

⁴ Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T & T Clark International, 2004). Regarding the influence of Hays, Watson (ibid, xii) notes, for example, that *Echoes of Scripture* "was, for me at least, the first indication that insights drawn from contemporary hermeneutics and literary theory could fruitfully be applied to Pauline interpretation in general, and to Paul's reading of scripture in particular."

⁵ The recent criticisms of Hays by Brevard S. Childs (*The Church's Guide for Reading Paul: The Canonical Shaping of the Pauline Corpus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 32–39) are colored by his own canonical concerns and need not detain us. Hays has also been repeatedly criticized by Stanley E. Porter

Metaleptic Allusion in the Work of Richard B. Hays

The publication of Hays's *Echoes of Scripture* in 1989 represents a watershed moment in the history of Pauline scholarship.⁶ Even Stanley, who is quite critical, as we shall see, concedes that "Nearly all subsequent studies of Paul's use of Scripture are indebted to Hays's work."⁷ Employing a minimalist notion of intertextuality as "the imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one,"⁸ something that "has always

("The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* [ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148, SSEJC 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997], 79–96[82–84]; idem, "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice* [ed. Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter; New Testament Monographs 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006], 98–110[103–106]; idem, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* [ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 29–40[37–39]). An earlier draft of this chapter included an extensive response to Porter. I have omitted that response from the present text, however, because of its length and because, except for his valid concern with Hays's lack of terminological clarity, Porter's objections either fail to account for the qualitative nature of Hays's work or are simply mistaken. I hope to publish the response to Porter separately. For other responses to Porter's objections, see J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 11–12, n. 44; Annette Merz, *Die fiktive Selbstauslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* (NTOA 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 102–4.

⁶ The title of his recent *Festschrift* (J. Ross Wagner, C. Kevin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb, eds., *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008]) alludes to the following passage from Hays (*Echoes of Scripture*, 33): "Despite all the careful hedges that we plant around texts, meaning has a way of leaping over, like sparks. Texts are not inert; they burn and throw fragments of flame on their rising heat. Often we succeed in containing the energy, but sometimes the sparks escape and kindle new blazes, reprises of the original fire." Note that Merz (*fiktive Selbstauslegung*, 104) finds this passage regrettable because, in her view, it undermines Hays's otherwise systematic and potent methodological considerations. These are detailed below.

⁷ "Paul and Scripture: Charting the Course," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 3–12[6]. For early appraisals of *Echoes of Scripture*, see especially Hans Hübner, "Intertextualität – die hermeneutische Strategie des Paulus: Zu einem neuen Versuch der theologischen Rezeption des Alten Testaments in Neuen," *TLZ* 116 (1991): 881–98; Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 83, Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993).

⁸ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 14. Hays (*ibid*, 15) eschews the robust notion of intertextuality as "the study of the semiotic matrix within which a text's acts of signification occur," exemplified in the work of Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes. He has been criticized for this, for example, by William Scott Green, "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture," in *Paul and the Scriptures of*

played a major role in the cultural traditions that are heirs to Israel's Scriptures,"⁹ Hays applies a poetic sensibility to the interpretation of Paul's use of scripture, not just his citations but his allusions and echoes as well, whether intentional or not. This poetic sensibility is especially indebted to John Hollander's conception of *metalepsis*, or *transumption*, derived from the study of Miltonic simile. Metalepsis is a literary technique whereby an author cites, alludes to, or echoes an older text in a newer one and thus draws a connection between the two texts that is not merely explicit in the citation/allusion/echo but is implicit, the consequence of discerning the unstated resonances between the two texts. As Hays puts it, metalepsis "functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed."¹⁰

Although "Quotation, allusion, and echo may be seen as points along a spectrum of intertextual reference, moving from the explicit to the subliminal," or from the

Israel (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 83, Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 58–63. For Hays's response to Green, see his, "On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 83, Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 70–96[79–81].

⁹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 14. To corroborate this claim, Hays points to the work of Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); idem, "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel," in *Midrash and Literature* (ed. Geoffrey H. Hartman and Budick Sanford; New Haven: Yale University, 1986), 19–37. See, for example, Fishbane's ("Inner Biblical Exegesis," 32–34) discussion of Azariah's speech in 2 Chron 15:2–7 as an example of the biblical precedent of incorporating old texts into a new situation to yield a new meaning.

¹⁰ *Echoes of Scripture*, 20. Similarly, illustrating the phenomenon of metalepsis from Milton, Hollander (*The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* [Berkeley: University of California, 1981], 115, italics his) points to Book I, lines 301–4 of *Paradise Lost* in which the multitudinousness of Satanic legions is likened to autumn leaves. What is left implicit in this metaleptic connection is that both leaves and rebel armies are fallen, and dead. Hollander further clarifies Miltonic simile (and thus metalepsis) by saying that it is "a form which likens A to B *in that* X is palpably true of them both, but with no mention of W, Y, and Z, which are also true of them both."

intentional (quotations and allusions) to the unintentional (echoes), Hays makes “no systematic distinction between the terms,” except that, in general, “*allusion* is used of obvious intertextual references, *echo* of subtler ones.”¹¹ This fluid approach allows Hays to hold together in creative tension the precise locus of the hermeneutical event that occurs in metalepsis, whether in the author’s mind, an original or contemporary reader, the text itself, or a community of interpretation. Ultimately, however, Hays advocates a “common sense” hermeneutics, rooted in the axiom that “there is an authentic analogy—though not a simple identity—between what the text meant and what it means.”¹²

An example of metalepsis drawn from Paul is the evocation of Ps 143(142):2 in Rom 3:20.¹³ These two texts are as follows:

Table 5. Ps 143(142):2 and Rom 3:20

Ps 143(142):2	Rom 3:20
² καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς κρίσιν μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου, ὅτι οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν.	²⁰ διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.
² And do not enter into judgment with your servant, because no one living will be justified before you.	²⁰ Wherefore from works of the Law no flesh will be justified before him, for through the Law [is] knowledge of sin.

While Paul has prefaced and followed his evocation with the explanatory glosses διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (“wherefore from works of the Law”) and διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (“for through the Law [is] knowledge of sin”), cited only part of the verse,

¹¹ *Echoes of Scripture*, 23, 29, italics his.

¹² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 27.

¹³ This example comes from Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 51–52. See also Hays’s article, “Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3,” *JBL* 99 (1980): 107–15, which is retitled “Psalm 143 as Testimony to the Righteousness of God,” chapter 3 of Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 50–60.

changed ζῶν (“living”) to σάρξ (“flesh”), and altered the psalmist’s direct address of God to a third person declaration, the echo of Ps 143(142):2, if not allusion, seems clear.¹⁴

That Paul’s evocation of Ps 143(142) may be intentional is suggested as one engages in metaleptic recovery of the implicit resonances between Ps 143(142) and the argument in Rom 3. Ps 143(142) is not, as v. 2 taken in isolation might suggest, a word of condemnation, but rather a Davidic plea for deliverance. The psalmist’s appeal to God’s ἀλήθεια (“truthfulness” in Ps 143[142]:1; cf. Rom 3:4, 7) and δικαιοσύνη (“righteousness” in Ps 143[142]:1, 11; cf. Rom 3:5, 21–22) as ground of hope and instrument of deliverance provides the background for the transition following the declaration that no flesh will be justified in Rom 3:20. Consequently,

when Paul writes in Rom. 3:21 that ‘now, apart from Law, the righteousness of God has been manifested, *witnessed by the Law and the Prophets*,’ he is making a claim that anyone who had ever prayed Psalm 143 from the heart would instantly recognize: God’s saving righteousness, for which the psalmist had hoped, has at last appeared.¹⁵

The evocation of Ps 143(142):2 in Rom 3:20, then, anticipates the turn Paul’s argument takes and in so doing forms a metaleptic bridge between Rom 3:20–21.¹⁶ As noted in chapter one, the allusions to Ps 106(105) in Rom 1 may also metaleptically anticipate later developments in Romans.

¹⁴ See also Job 4:17: Τί γάρ; μὴ καθαρὸς ἔσται βροτὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ἄμemptος ἀνὴρ; With its reference to works, this text may serve as an intermediary between Ps 143(142):2 and Rom 3:20. May thanks to Robert A. Di Vito for bringing Job 4:17 to my attention.

¹⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 52, italics his.

¹⁶ Hays’s argument regarding the role of Ps 143(142) in the transition between Rom 3:20–21 has convinced Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 337, among others.

Of course, for one so steeped in the language of scripture as Paul, he was bound to express himself in ways that inevitably echoed scriptural texts on a regular basis without any metaleptic intentions. Although the detection of echoes need not be tied to authorial intent for Hays,¹⁷ he does introduce in *Echoes of Scripture* seven criteria for detecting metalepsis which act as methodological controls.¹⁸ These criteria are: (1) *Availability*. Was the suggested source of metalepsis available to the author and readers? (2) *Volume*. This includes the degree of repetition of words and syntactical patterns in the citation/allusion/echo as well as the prominence of the older text and whether the older text appears at a key juncture in the newer text. (3) *Recurrence*. How often does Paul cite/allude to/echo the particular text under consideration? (4) *Thematic Coherence*. How well does the supposed metalepsis fit into Paul's line of argument? (5) *Historical Plausibility*. Could Paul have intended and his readers understood the meaning of the supposed metalepsis? (6) *History of Interpretation*. Have other readers detected the metalepsis being considered? (7) *Satisfaction*. In the end, how satisfying is the metaleptic proposal? This is the most important criterion for Hays.

In his 1998 article, "Who Has Believed Our Message?," republished most recently in 2005, Hays further discusses the "*aesthetic* judgment" involved in discerning the presence and significance of metaleptic allusions, endorsing once again his seven

¹⁷ Indeed, Hays ("Who Has Believed Our Message? Paul's Reading of Isaiah," in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* [Richard B. Hays; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 25–49[49]) notes that "Later readers may recognize Paul's echoes of Isaiah," for example, "and legitimately develop some theological implications of the intertextual links that had not occurred to Paul himself."

¹⁸ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29–32.

criteria as “modestly useful rules of thumb,” before restating and elaborating on them.¹⁹

His additional comments on criteria (2) *Volume* and (5) *Historical Plausibility* are important to note because they have been neglected in subsequent critiques, especially the latter in the critique of Stanley.²⁰ Observing that “Of the seven tests suggested in *Echoes*,” *Volume* “has been perhaps the most subject to misunderstanding, because I did not explain it very fully there,” Hays proceeds to clarify that *Volume* concerns “how insistently the echo presses itself upon the reader.”²¹ This involves three factors. First and foremost is the degree of verbal as well as syntactical repetition. This factor presupposes knowledge of the text form available to Paul and his readers. Although Hays regards this as “a complex technical problem that admits few certain answers,” he points to the “most comprehensive study of this problem,” Stanley’s own 1992 *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, before siding with the consensus view that Paul relies upon the LXX, even if he himself knew Hebrew.²² We shall return to the matter of text forms in the second part of this chapter.

As an illustration of verbal and syntactical repetition, consider the evocation of Ps 143(142):2 in Rom 3:20, briefly discussed already (cf. p. 128). Four out of the following seven terms are identical, with only small differences in order:

¹⁹ Hays, ““Who Has Believed Our Message?”,” 30, 34–45, italics his.

²⁰ Porter (“Use,” 83; “Further Comments,” 103; “Allusions and Echoes,” 38) neglects Hays’s additional comments on the former (*Volume*) when he repeatedly criticizes Hays for problematically defining one metaphor (echo) with another (volume). As we shall now see, Hays identifies this criterion with three more or less concrete factors and thus he cannot be charged with simply using one metaphor to define another.

²¹ Hays, ““Who Has Believed Our Message?”,” 34.

²² Hays, ““Who Has Believed Our Message?”,” 35–36. The reference to Stanley is found in n. 20.

Table 6. Verbal and Syntactical Repetition in Ps 143(142):2 and Rom 3:20

Ps 143(142):2	ὅτι <i>because</i>	οὐ δικαιωθήσεται shall not be justified	ἐνώπιόν σου before <i>you</i>	πᾶς ζῶν all <i>living</i> [persons]
Rom 3:20	διότι ... <i>wherefore</i>	οὐ δικαιωθήσεται shall not be justified	πᾶσα σὰρξ all <i>flesh</i>	ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ before <i>him</i>

Moreover, the function or referent of the three words that are not identical is either the same, or similar. The terms ὅτι and διότι are both subordinating conjunctions; the referent of σου as well as αὐτοῦ is God; and both ζῶν and σὰρξ refer to humanity, though, in my view, the substitution of the latter term possesses added import because of Paul's *flesh–Spirit* antithesis,²³ just as the insertion of ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (“from works of the Law”) in Rom 3:20 (cf. the preceding chart) is exegetically significant for Paul's theology. In any case, the *Volume* for this evocation, in terms of verbal and syntactical repetition, is quite high.

The second factor concerns the prominence of the precursor text. Continuing with the same example, it must be conceded that Ps 143(142):2, while no doubt important to the psalm in which it appears, is nonetheless not especially prominent. In contrast, for example, to the *Shema* of Deut 6:4, “Hear, O Israel: the Lord Our God is one Lord” (*NETS*), a well-known creedal statement employed by Paul in 1 Cor 8:6, one cannot be confident that the language of Ps 143(142):2 would have been widely recognized.

Yet, if the *Volume* falls in light of this second factor, it once again rises when the third factor is taken into account: the rhetorical stress upon the phrase(s) in both the precursor and Pauline texts. As noted previously, the placement of the evocation in the

²³ Cf. n. 1 of chapter two.

latter is particularly significant in that Rom 3:20 concludes Paul's indictment of Jewish and Gentile sin (cf. Rom 3:9), paving the way for his proclamation of justification by faith in Rom 3:21 ff. The point here, however, is not to argue for the evocation of Ps 143(142):2 in Rom 3:20 but to utilize this example to illustrate the three distinct aspects involved in the single criterion of *Volume*. This tripartite character of the *Volume* criterion will be important to keep in mind in evaluating my claim that Deut 9:1–10:22 is evoked throughout Rom 2:5–11. Although the verbal and syntactical repetition between these two texts is not extensive, the prominence of verses evoked in the precursor text and the rhetorical stress in both passages are significant.

Turning to *Historical Plausibility*, the basic idea behind this criterion is to take seriously the "historical situatedness of Paul's letters" in relation to author and audience.²⁴ With regard to Paul the author, this includes understanding how his allusions to Israel's sacred texts may reflect readings that are both similar to and yet different from other Jews of his time. Hays notes that the latter possibility "should not necessarily function as a negative constraint, because Paul was no doubt a reasonably original thinker who was capable of formulating fresh echoes and unprecedented readings." Pauline originality, however, has implications for his audience, as "many of his more subtle allusions might have eluded his Gentile readers." This is not the only place in which Hays notes such a possibility.²⁵ Indeed, in responding to an objection by J. Christiaan Beker

²⁴ Hays, "Who Has Believed Our Message?," 41. So also the following two quotations.

²⁵ "We should always bear in mind, of course, that Paul might have written things that were not readily intelligible to his actual readers," *Echoes of Scripture*, 30.

about the “communication structure” of Paul’s evocations, Hays had previously said the following:

If these letters are pastoral communications addressing contingent situations, as Beker rightly insists, how effective are Paul’s indirect echoes of a text that his readers, mostly Gentile converts, may not know very well in the first place? The question is an important one. The answer, of course, is that the effectiveness of Paul’s communication strategy varies with different situations and with different readers/hearers. Each case must be considered individually. It would be wrong, however, to assume that Paul was always a consummate communicator. The evidence suggests otherwise: he was trying, with mixed results, to resocialize his converts into a new symbolic world that was still in process of formation even in his own mind. There were some successes, some failures. Often it appears that his readers found him baffling. One reason for their incomprehension may have been that he was not able to fill in all the gaps left for his hearers by his allusive references to Scripture; he may have been consistently presupposing knowledge that he ought not to have presupposed.²⁶

Returning to “Who Has Believed Our Message?,” Hays further observes that the criterion of *Historical Plausibility* “requires of us a broad historical construction of the hermeneutical horizon and reader-competence of Paul and his first-century readers”; yet in the conclusion to his essay, Hays cautions against a pessimistic assessment:

We should give Paul and his readers credit for being at least as sophisticated and nuanced in their reading of Scripture as we are. Everything about Paul’s use of OT texts suggests that his ‘implied reader’ not only knows Scripture but also appreciates allusive subtlety.²⁷

There is, of course, tension between the acknowledgment, in response to Beker, that Paul’s *actual* readers often “found him baffling,” and the characterization of the Pauline *implied* reader as someone who “knows Scripture but also appreciates allusive subtlety.” If, in interpretive practice, Hays tends towards the latter, then Stanley tends towards the

²⁶ Hays, “On the Rebound,” 86.

²⁷ Hays, ““Who Has Believed Our Message?”,” 42, 49 respectively.

former. Before going on to consider Stanley's objections, however, we need to discuss Watson's extension of Hays's methodology and my employment of both.

Complex Conversation in the Work of Francis Watson

Inspired by Hays's description of Romans as "an intertextual conversation between Paul and the voice of Scripture,"²⁸ Francis Watson's 2004 *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* applies this metaphor of a "conversation" to the Pauline letters, in general (especially Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians), and further develops the metaphor by including a third party in the conversation, the scriptural interpretation reflected in select writings of Paul's non-Christian Jewish contemporaries.²⁹ In the complex conversation that results, Watson is careful to stress the agency of both the *interpreters* and *texts*, an agency that is implicit in the conversation metaphor itself. If two interpreters, in this case Paul and a non-Christian Jewish contemporary, disagree about the meaning of a particular text, it is not necessarily because one or the other is imposing his will on the text. This latter supposition underestimates the agency of the text, which often invites its own readings. Rather, what such interpretive disagreements illustrate is how each interpreter presents us with "divergent realizations of the text's own

²⁸ *Echoes of Scripture*, 35.

²⁹ *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 4, n. 2. In this same footnote in which he expresses his indebtedness to Hays for the "conversation" metaphor, Watson also says that "Hays acknowledges the desirability of including a third participant in the conversation, in the form of non-Christian Jewish exegesis," pointing to Hays's ("On the Rebound," 70–73) response to the critique of *Echoes of Scripture* by Craig A. Evans ("Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* [ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 83, Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993], 47–51). The topic of discussion between Hays and Evans, however, centers on the need to take Jewish interpretive tradition into account in understanding Paul's own reading of the text (cf. Deut 30:12–14; Rom 10:5–10; *Targ. Neof.* Deut 30:12–13), not to compare Pauline readings with those of his non-Christian Jewish contemporaries. Hays does call for such a comparison, but it is in his elaboration on the criterion of *Historical Plausibility* ("Who Has Believed Our Message?," 41), not in response to Evans.

semantic potential.”³⁰ Thus, for example, in his chapter on Exodus, Watson notes how Paul’s implicit interpretation of Exod 32–34 in 2 Cor 3:7–18 differs from that of Philo in *Mos.* 2.159–173. Whereas Paul’s negative association of the Law with death finds substantiation in the Levitical slaughter of 3,000 Israelites (Exod 32:25–28), Philo focuses instead on the blessing and privileged status awarded to the Levites for their zealous act which cleansed the community of apostates (Exod 32:29).

This phenomenon of divergent realizations of a text’s semantic potential illustrated by Paul and Philo does not suggest that all readings are equal; it does, however, suggest that differing readings are rarely, if ever, entirely arbitrary. In fact, according to Watson, the intertextual engagement with scripture that is fundamental to Pauline and Second Temple discourse means that “these ‘early Jewish’ texts, Christian or otherwise, can ... be located within a single intertextual field – not in spite of their interpretative differences, but precisely because of them.”³¹ It is the disagreements, in other words, that make the tripartite conversation interesting.

In terms of Paul’s own conversation with scripture, Watson argues that “for Paul divine saving action is the comprehensive context both of ‘christology’ and of ‘ecclesiology’”; in other words, “Paul’s exegesis is determined by his soteriology.”³²

³⁰ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, x.

³¹ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 5.

³² Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 19. In identifying soteriology, rather than christology or ecclesiology as central to Paul’s thought, Watson parts ways with both Hays and E. P. Sanders respectively. Christopher D. Stanley (“A Decontextualized Paul? A Response to Francis Watson’s *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*,” *JSNT* 28 [2006]: 353–62[359]), however, neglects Watson’s intentional departure from and even critique of Hays’s *ecclesiocentric* reading of Paul and proceeds to cite this *ecclesiocentric* reading against Watson.

Specifically, this soteriology, inspired by Hab 2:4, takes an antithetical form in contrasting divine and human initiative. If certain of Paul's non-Christian Jewish contemporaries stress the latter, employing a hermeneutics of Law, Paul stresses the former, employing a hermeneutics of faith. What is crucial for Watson is that the tension between these two modes of action, faith and works, is central to Pauline theology only because it is, in the first instance, inherent to scripture in its canonical form. In fact, "Paul cites individual texts not in an *ad hoc* manner but on the basis of a radical construal of the narrative shape of the Pentateuch as a whole, highlighting and exploiting tensions between Genesis and Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy."³³

This Pauline construal of the Pentateuch, which gives rise to the classic themes of Pauline theology, may be summarized as follows:

[I]n his reading of Genesis, Paul emphasizes God's unconditional promise to Abraham of universal salvation and Abraham's response of faith, which Paul finds fulfilled in the Christ-event and Christian reliance on it. Exodus introduces the Law, which upon its first appearance ... brings death to its recipients. Leviticus's promise of life through obedience to the Law (Lev 18:5) is therefore hollow, not only because of the calamity narrated in Exodus but also because of the subsequent slaughter of surviving Israelites (see especially Num 26:63-65). Finally, Deuteronomy's assurance that the Law can be followed (Deut 30:11-14) is subverted by its placement at the end of a series of curses against those unable to follow it (27:11-26).³⁴

Although I find Watson's proposal regarding Paul's narrative construal of the Pentateuch intriguing, what is important for my purposes is his notion of complex conversation with

³³ Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 3.

³⁴ Barry S. Crawford, "Review of *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*," *CBQ* 68 (2006): 559–60[560].

its emphasis on Paul's exploitation of scriptural tensions. This leads me to discuss how I employ the methodology of Hays and Watson in my own analysis.

Employing Metaleptic Allusion and Complex Conversation

As should be apparent from chapter one, metaleptic allusion and complex conversation figure prominently in this study. Beginning with the latter, Watsons's notion of complex conversation is particularly important for the proposal in chapter six that Paul's decision to construct his argument in Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, a particular conversation about Jewish identity, one involving the traditions of Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106). If Paul was such a participant, then his contribution, as we shall see, exploits the inner tensions of Pss 105(104)–107(106), Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10, and even the conversation itself. Turning to Hays, Paul's evocations of Ps 106(105), whether ironic, inferential, or indirect, are all metaleptic in nature. Although Hays's methodological criteria will not be utilized as an analytic template to assess these evocations, each one arguably fulfills all seven criteria, especially when the tripartite character of *Volume* is taken into account. In addition, I employ metaleptic methodology to interpret the biblical evocations throughout Ps 106(105) and the allusion to Exod 34:6–10 in Wis 15:1–6, thereby showing the applicability of Hays's work beyond Pauline scholarship.³⁵

³⁵ I have also fruitfully employed Hays's methodology to interpret the use of scriptural texts in 1QS. See Alec J. Lucas, "Scripture Citations as an Internal Redactional Control: 1QS 5:1–20a and Its 4Q Parallels," *DSD* 17 (2010): 30–52.

One way in which I attempt to improve upon Hays concerns terminology.

Although rightly locating intertextual references along a continuum moving from the intentional (quotations and allusions) to the unintentional (echoes), Hays's failure to distinguish systematically between his use of intertextual terms, while defensible to a degree, lends itself to a lack of clarity. In particular, despite his pledge of restricting general usage to subtle intertextual references, Hays often employs *echo* as an umbrella term for the phenomenon of metalepsis. For example, the title of his book is *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* even though, technically speaking, his book concerns the phenomenon of metalepsis, of which echo is only one part. Such imprecision provides the potential for confusion.

As an improvement, I shall strive for clarity and consistency in the use of intertextual terms.³⁶ Most important, for my purposes, is the term *allusion* or its synonym *evocation*. Allusion should, as Hays suggests, be understood in relation to the middle ground it occupies between *echo* and *quotation*, or its synonym *citation*. Echoes are best defined as unintentional references to a particular passage, place, person, theme, action, or event, that are, in principle, capable of recognition by the audience or even by the author/speaker. An audience member, for example, may recognize an unwitting echo on the part of an author/speaker, one that the author/speaker would then acknowledge if

³⁶ For alternate discussions and definitions of terms such as *quotation*, *allusion*, and *echo*, see Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 15–24; Steve Moyise, “Quotations,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 15–28; Porter, “Further Comments,” 106–9; idem, “Allusions and Echoes,” 29–40. Note that whereas Porter (“Further Comments,” 109) at first says that “an allusion may or may not be consciously intentional,” he (“Allusions and Echoes,” 35) later says that “Intentionality appears to be a necessary but not sufficient means by which one can distinguish an allusion.”

brought to her or his attention. What distinguishes echoes from allusions and quotations is authorial intention, not audience recognition.³⁷ Ordinarily, however, an audience, at least some portion of the original one, would recognize both. It may not always be easy to discern the presence, as opposed to absence, of authorial intention. This difficulty, however, inheres primarily, if not exclusively, in the reader's/hearer's act of interpretation rather than in the author's/speaker's act of communication.

In terms of distinguishing between allusions and quotations, two points must be borne in mind. First, one can allude to a particular passage, place, person, theme, action, or event, but one can only quote a text, whether written or oral. In the former sense, then, allusions may be allied with echoes over and against quotations. This is significant because part of my argument is that in alluding to the golden calf incident, Paul at the same time intends to evoke cultural-thematic associations related to Jewish denunciations of Egyptian theriolatry, denunciations that would be undermined by a prominent theriolatrous event in Israel's own history. Second, it is also the higher *Volume* associated with quotations that differentiate them from allusions. Although this higher *Volume* would normally be the consequence of a greater degree of verbal/syntactical repetition, one should avoid delimiting quotations, for example, to three or more words.³⁸ Still less

³⁷ The concept of *intention* operative here should not be understood as privileged access into the author's mind, that is, in psychological terms apart from the text, but rather as the author's attempt to communicate meaning in written form. Similarly, Christopher A. Beetham (*Echoes*, 14, n. 10), who refers to E. D. Hirsch Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale, 1967), 1–19.

³⁸ Although noting that formulaic quotations "can be from one word to many more words," Porter ("Further Comments," 107–8) sets the minimum limit of such quotations, as well as ones without introductory formulae, to three words because "Two words might be a coincidence...." For unmarked citations especially, this limit should be understood in relation to Porter's ("Use," 83) dismissal of *Thematic Coherence* as a factor to consider in determining a citation. If one stipulates that two words are sufficient to constitute an unmarked citation, irrespective of *Thematic Coherence* or lack thereof, then the likelihood of

should one equate this higher *Volume* with the rhetorical stress gained by including an introductory formula. Even if quotations often comprise more than three words and are prefaced by an introductory formula, there are exceptions due to the prominence of the words cited. The so-called shortest verse in the Bible comes to mind: “Jesus wept” (NIV, John 11:35).³⁹ It is, then, I suggest, not possible to quantify the *Volume*-level that divides quotations from allusions precisely because *Volume* is a complex concept, consisting of the interrelated factors of verbal/syntactical repetition, prominence, and rhetorical stress.

This impossibility of quantifying the *Volume*-level that differentiates quotations from allusions is not significant for my study, since there is no question of elevating Paul’s appeals to Ps 106(105) from the status of allusions to that of quotations. What is significant, however, is the issue of audience recognition. My argument presumes, at the very least, that Paul expected the original audience to grasp his ironic, inferential, and indirect evocations of Ps 106(105). Whether or not it is right to credit Paul with such an expectation and whether or not an ancient audience, in particular the Christian community in Rome, could have grasped such evocations is what we turn to consider.

Importance of the Original Audience and Other Ancient Realities

In the context of critiquing the methodology of Richard B. Hays as well as that of Francis Watson, Christopher D. Stanley has raised the question of whether Paul’s original audiences could, in historical reality, have recognized unmarked citations, allusions and echoes, much less reflected on implicit contextual parallels between Pauline and

two terms randomly coinciding is, indeed, high. If, however, one takes *Thematic Coherence* into account in the determining process, then such coincidences may be largely, if not entirely, dismissed.

³⁹ In Greek, of course, the statement consists of three words: ἔδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

precursor texts.⁴⁰ According to Stanley, Hays, like most contemporary interpreters, “fails to consider the profound differences in the literary capabilities of ancient and modern readers; as a result, he slides too quickly from literary analyses into historical judgments,” a slide that leads to “Hays’s ahistorical understanding of Paul’s audiences.”⁴¹ Similarly, Watson “fails to take seriously the real-world social context of Paul’s letters,” one that includes limited audience capabilities and other ancient realities.⁴²

Since Hays, in particular, as noted above (cf. pp. 133ff.), acknowledges the possibility that many of Paul’s “more subtle allusions might have eluded his Gentile readers” and even calls for a “broad historical construction of the hermeneutical competence and reader-competence of Paul and his first-century readers” in his 1998 article, “Who Has Believed Our Message?,” an article Stanley neglects, it is tempting simply to cite this fact along with the previous critical responses by J. Ross Wagner as well as Brian J. Abasciano and then to mitigate, if not dismiss, Stanley’s concerns.⁴³ In

⁴⁰ Christopher D. Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’: Did Paul’s Audiences Understand His Biblical Quotations?” *NovT* 41 (1999): 124–44; idem, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 38–61; idem, “Decontextualized Paul?” 353–62; idem, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 125–55. Interestingly, Stanley’s (*Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* [Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992], 35–36) charge of neglecting “the actual literary competence of the original readers,” which would later be directed at Hays and then Watson, was first levelled at Dietrich-Alex Koch’s (*Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* [BHT 69; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986], 11–24) criteria for determining what constitutes a citation in Paul.

⁴¹ Stanley, *Arguing*, 47, n. 29. Cf. idem, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 132, n. 24.

⁴² Stanley, “Decontextualized Paul?” 360.

⁴³ Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 33–39; Brian J. Abasciano, “Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley Concerning the Reader Competency of Paul’s Original Audiences,” *NovT* 49 (2007): 153–83. See also the response to Stanley by Bruce N. Fisk (“Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge Among the Christians of Rome,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture* [ed.

view of the centrality of Hays's concept of metaleptic allusion and Watson's notion of complex conversation to this study, however, I shall resist that temptation and give Stanley's objections the attention they deserve. In the process, I shall build upon previous critiques by proposing that Stanley's assumed paradigm of *literacy*, distinct from the issue of ancient literacy, casts an overly skeptical shadow on the capabilities of Paul's original audiences, one that is removed once the paradigm of *fluency* is adopted instead. Positively, considering Stanley's objections will allow us to appreciate the role of orality in metalepsis and Stanley's emphasis on biblical excerpts may even offer support for my proposal.

Christopher D. Stanley's Objections

Introduction: Paul's, Hays's, or Stanley's Misjudgment?

Stanley's objections are aimed at what he regards in his 1999 article as ten questionable scholarly assumptions about the manner in which Paul and his audiences interacted with scriptural texts, a figure that is reduced to nine in the revised version of this article that appears as chapter three of his 2004 monograph.⁴⁴ It is important to note that Stanley does not dismiss every assumption he considers. Although he regards it as questionable that "*Paul's audiences acknowledged the authority of the Jewish Scriptures as a source of truth and a guide for Christian conduct*," because some, "like Marcion and

Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 157–85) as well as Francis Watson's ("Paul the Reader: An Authorial Apologia," *JSNT* 28 [2006]: 363–73) own response.

⁴⁴ The differences between the articulation of the assumptions extends beyond the mere elimination of one of them. Assumption 3, or A3, in 1999 becomes A1 in 2004. A1 and A2 of 1999 then become A2 and A3 respectively in 2004. A4 and A6 are the same in both. A5 of 1999 is eliminated, presumably because it essentially restates A4. A7 and A8 in 1999 reappear with revised wording as A5 and A7 respectively in 2004. Finally, A9 and A10 in 1999 become A8 and A9 in 2004. Cf. n. 40 for bibliographic information.

the gnostics in a later period,” may have disputed the validity of biblical proofs, Stanley ultimately concludes that “in view of the broad acceptance of the Jewish Scriptures in other sectors of the Christian church, it seems fair to assume that the bulk of Paul’s audience would have acknowledged the authority of the biblical text.”⁴⁵ Because Stanley does not dismiss every assumption he considers and there is significant overlap between the assumptions he challenges, scholars who discuss his work tend to summarize his central concerns in two or three points.⁴⁶ I shall do the same.

Before engaging in this summary, it is also important to note that Stanley’s stance develops between its initial articulation and most recent reiteration. Central to Stanley’s position is the distinction between the *actual* audiences to whom Paul wrote and Paul’s *perception* of those audiences reflected in his letters, or the “implied reader,” which, as Stanley observes, “is an artificial construct inferred from the various interpretational demands that a text imposes upon its readers as they move through a document from beginning to end.”⁴⁷ Initially, Stanley accepts the consensus view that “Paul routinely assumes that his audience ... knows the biblical text well enough to supply the background and context for many of his quotations,” yet he regards it as “highly unlikely that many members of Paul’s first-century readers would have matched the profile of the

⁴⁵ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 131; idem, *Arguing*, 40. Italics original in both.

⁴⁶ Abasciano, “Diamonds,” 155; Moyise, “Quotations,” 23–24.

⁴⁷ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 142.

‘implied readers’ of Paul’s quotations.”⁴⁸ Consequently, Stanley asks: “Is it possible that Paul might have misjudged the capacities of his audience?”⁴⁹

This manner of formulating the issue, however, exposes Stanley to the obvious objection, as noted by Abasciano, that it is “presumptuous to claim to know Paul’s audiences better than he did,” since Paul was surely “in a much better position to judge the reader competence of his first-century Christian audiences than we are thousands of years after the fact.”⁵⁰ Precisely because this objection is so problematic for Stanley’s initial formulation, one must recognize that Stanley’s view has, even though without acknowledgment, subtly shifted by the end of his 2004 monograph.⁵¹

In the course of this 2004 monograph, Stanley analyzes Pauline citations in Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians from three distinct standpoints. The first is the informed audience member “who knows the original context of every one of Paul’s quotations and is willing to engage in critical dialogue with Paul about his handling of the biblical text.”⁵² Since Stanley identifies this vantage point as the one “from which most contemporary scholars analyze Paul’s quotations,” it would seem that this informed interpreter, even if idealized, is to be equated with the consensus view of Paul’s implied

⁴⁸ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 124, 144 respectively. Another point at which Stanley shows his acceptance of the consensus view of Paul’s implied audiences is in the following statement: “From the way Paul handles the biblical text, it seems that he expected his first-century audience to know the background and context of his many quotations, allusions, and other references to the Jewish Scriptures” (p. 133). Cf. idem, *Arguing*, 38, 63–65.

⁴⁹ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 125; idem, *Arguing*, 39.

⁵⁰ Abasciano, “Diamonds,” 162–63.

⁵¹ Abasciano (“Diamonds,” 153–83) neglects this shift.

⁵² The preceding quotation as well as those that follow in this paragraph come from Stanley, *Arguing*, 68–69.

audience. The second standpoint is the competent audience member “who knows just enough of the Jewish Scriptures to grasp the point of Paul’s quotations in their current rhetorical context.” Actual individuals in this category “may or may not have been literate, but they would have known at least the broad parameters of the Jewish Scriptures as a result of instruction that they had received in Jewish or Christian circles prior to their encounter with Paul’s quotations.” And the third standpoint is the minimal audience member, a person “aware of the high degree of respect given to the Scriptures in Christian circles” but who possesses “little specific knowledge about the content of the Jewish Scriptures” and thus “must make sense of Paul’s quotations on this basis.” Actual persons in this category “would have been illiterate Gentiles, though literate recent converts might also be found here.”

With his analysis of Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, and Galatians from these three distinct standpoints complete at the end of his monograph, Stanley’s changed position is evident in his conclusion that “Paul seems to have directed his quotations toward an implied audience that resembled the ‘competent audience’ more closely than the ‘informed audience’ or the ‘minimal audience.’”⁵³ In other words, Stanley’s view of Paul’s implied audiences has been downgraded from “informed” to “competent.” This shift is then given repeated expression in Stanley’s 2008 essay. For example, even in the

⁵³ Stanley, *Arguing*, 172. A close reading of Stanley’s 1999 article in comparison with the revised version that appears in 2004 shows that this shift was already underway. For example, whereas Stanley (“‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 128, italics mine) initially follows the assumption that Paul’s audiences regularly read and studied biblical texts while Paul was absent with the statement that “*In many of his references to the Jewish Scriptures, Paul seems to assume that his audience will not only recognize the names of major biblical characters, but also know the background and context of rather obscure biblical verses,*” he (*Arguing*, 43, italics mine) later changes this to “*In at least some of his quotations, Paul clearly assumes that his audience is familiar with the background and context of specific verses from the Jewish Scriptures (e.g., Rom 4:9–22, 9:10–13, 11:1–4; Gal 3:6–9, 4:21–31).*”

exceptional texts in which “Paul alludes to a particular biblical passage or story in the expectation that the audience will be able to supply the portions that he omits,” such as Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 10:1–12; 2 Cor 3:7–18; Gal 3:6–8, 16, 28; 4:21–31, Stanley now suggests that “the type and amount of biblical knowledge that would have been required to follow Paul’s biblical argumentation is consistent with what we might expect from a functionally illiterate Gentile audience who had received a modest amount of biblical instruction in a Christian setting.”⁵⁴ Along with this demotion in implied audience capability is a redirection of the misjudgment charge reflected in Stanley’s proposal of the following dilemma: “Either Paul was rhetorically inept in failing to take account of the literary capabilities of his audiences or Hays and his followers have misjudged what Paul was doing with his biblical references. We cannot have it both ways.”⁵⁵

Since Stanley is so convinced that certain ancient realities would have impeded audience abilities, he does not even consider the possibility that his own shifted view may be the problem. Either Paul is rhetorically inept or Hays and his followers, like Watson, Wagner, and this study, have misjudged him. Before detailing the ancient realities that led to this shift, one final comment is in order. What began as a challenge to scholars to grapple with their assumptions about Paul’s *implied* audiences in light of what may be

⁵⁴ Stanley, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 135. Similar statements expressing Stanley’s changed view regarding Paul’s implied audiences include: “Paul was aware of the limited biblical knowledge of his intended audiences and crafted his arguments to suit their capabilities” (p. 135); “Unless we see evidence to the contrary, we should assume that Paul was at least broadly aware of the abilities and limitations of his audiences and that he took these factors into account when composing his letters, since this is one of the primary tasks of an effective rhetor” (p. 136). Anticipations of this changed position may be found in Stanley’s (“‘Pearls Before Swine,’” 139) 1999 article; for example, “It seems equally clear that Paul was aware of the limitations of his audience and made an effort to adapt his appeals to Scripture accordingly.”

⁵⁵ Stanley, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 146.

generally discerned about his *actual* audiences, has become a proposal for a new understanding of those *implied* audiences as well. This may absolve Stanley of the charge that he has presumptuously claimed to know Paul's audiences better than the apostle, but it comes at the cost of challenging the established consensus regarding a relatively high degree scriptural familiarity among the *implied* audiences of Pauline letters. Although it is beyond the scope of the present study to evaluate this challenge, I shall provide reason for thinking that Stanley's slide from the issue of literacy into the paradigm of literacy may be the primary misjudgment that has occurred.

Inaccessibility

There are two proposed ancient realities, each complex in itself, that led Stanley to change his view of Paul's implied audiences. One is the inaccessibility of texts. This inaccessibility is comprised of three factors. The first is the nature of scriptural texts. Although "[s]cholars routinely speak about 'the Septuagint' as though it were a single-volume text that could be pulled down from the shelf of an ancient library or purchased for study by anyone with the time and inclination to do so," Stanley notes that in Paul's day the Septuagint "was a diverse collection of scrolls containing Greek versions of a variety of Jewish works translated over the course of two centuries or more in a wide variety of times and circumstance."⁵⁶ The scrolls comprising the Septuagint, moreover, would have been difficult to navigate as they would have had "no chapter or verse

⁵⁶ Stanley, "'Pearls Before Swine'," 126. Cf. idem, *Arguing*, 41; Stanley E. Porter, "Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 97–124[120–21].

divisions or other textual markers that would allow the reader to easily locate and examine specific texts.”⁵⁷

The second factor relates to the possession and consultation of scriptural texts. These scrolls would have been prohibitively expensive to the point that “few people in Paul’s day could have afforded to purchase a single book from the Jewish Scriptures, much less an entire collection.”⁵⁸ Tensions between the nascent church and synagogue may have also limited one’s abilities to consult the texts in the possession of synagogues. And even Paul himself, whose finances were often precarious, may have found it difficult to transport what scrolls he did own during his arduous journeys. Although acknowledging that Paul and other early Christian authors “must have had at least sporadic access to the major biblical scrolls,” since they regularly studied them and that wealthy patrons may have purchased scrolls for personal and/or ecclesial use, Stanley goes so far as to suggest that “For the ordinary person in Paul’s churches, a first-hand encounter with a biblical scroll was probably an unusual event.”⁵⁹ Instead of scrolls, Stanley proposes that the primary written medium through which Paul and others encountered scriptural texts was through excerpts and anthologies, whether in wax

⁵⁷ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 129; idem, *Arguing*, 44. Cf. idem, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 142.

⁵⁸ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 127; idem, *Arguing*, 42. Cf. idem, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 141.

⁵⁹ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 127–28. Cf. idem, *Arguing*, 43; idem, “Paul and Scripture,” 142.

tablets, papyrus sheets, or parchment notebooks.⁶⁰ This proposal of anthological engagement on the part of Paul explains the diversity of text-types found in his quotations to the point that “repeated quotations from a particular book of Scripture show divergent textual affiliations even within the same letter,” since Paul may have “copied his excerpts from a variety of manuscripts housed at sites all around the eastern Mediterranean world, where he was a constant traveler.”⁶¹ The casualty of this sort of scriptural engagement, however, would have been the surrounding context, the very thing so important for metaleptic resonances.

The third and final factor relates not to the inaccessibility of scriptural texts but of Pauline ones. In the words of Stanley:

Unless someone were to reread the letters aloud in a public or private setting, the illiterate majority of the congregation would have been unable to refer back to Paul’s letters on their own to study his use of the Jewish Scriptures. *Their only encounter with his quotations would have come in the brief moment of oral recitation*, which usually gave few clues as to the original location or context of the passage.⁶²

Taken as a whole, these three factors related to the inaccessibility of texts, the nature of the scriptural texts (no chapter or verse divisions), the inability to consult scriptural scrolls due to the prohibitive costs necessary to acquire them or tensions with

⁶⁰ Stanley (*Paul*, 74–77) provides “a brief survey of some of the evidence for the common ancient practice of compiling excerpts....” Cf. e.g. Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.6.14; Cicero, *De Inventione* 2.4; *4QTestamonia*.

⁶¹ Stanley, *Paul*, 68, 78 respectively. Cf. also p. 257. As an example of these divergent textual affiliations of the same biblical book within one Pauline letter, Stanley (*ibid*, 68, n. 16) cites Paul’s agreement “with B V over against A Q (or A F) in his quotations from Isaiah and the Pentateuch in Rom 9.28, 13.9a, and Gal 3.8, 3.10, contrary to his practice in Rom 9.20, 9.27, 9.33/10.11, 11.34, 14.11, and Gal 3.10, 3.12.” Stanley develops this connection between the diversity of text-types in Paul and the use of excerpts/anthologies from Koch, *Schrift*, 48–57, 99–101, 253, 284.

⁶² Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 130, italics mine.

synagogue communities in possession of them, as well as the fleeting opportunity to receive Pauline letters in “*the brief moment of oral recitation*,” suggest that even in the best of circumstances it would be difficult to develop a deep scriptural knowledge against which to measure Paul’s metaleptic invocations. Difficulty, however, devolves into seeming impossibility once the potential of an “illiterate majority” is taken into consideration.

Literacy

As the label “illiterate majority” suggests, the other ancient reality that led Stanley to change his view of Paul’s implied audiences is *literacy*. This term, however, as utilized by Stanley, must be understood in two distinct senses. The first and primary meaning is literacy considered as the measure of one’s ability to read and write.⁶³ In his 1999 article and its 2004 revision, Stanley argues that William V. Harris’s influential estimate of 10 to 20 percent literacy within the classical, Hellenistic, and Roman imperial periods and Harry Y. Gamble’s similar analysis of early Christianity point to this inevitable conclusion: “[N]ot more than a few individuals in Paul’s churches, those recruited from the educated elite, would have been capable of reading and studying the Scriptures for themselves.”⁶⁴

⁶³ On the difficulty of defining literacy precisely, see William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1989), 3–5.

⁶⁴ Stanley, “‘Pearls Before Swine’,” 199; idem, *Arguing*, 45. Cf. Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 323–37; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995), 2–10. Casey Wayne Davis (*Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians* [JSNTSup 172; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999], 23–25) comes to a similar assessment of literacy within the Pauline communities.

In his 2008 essay, Stanley also disputes the common claim that literacy rates among Jewish congregational members would have been higher.⁶⁵ This claim is common because of statements like this from Josephus' *Ag. Ap.* 2.204:

Indeed, not even on the occasion of the birth of children did it [the law] permit laying on feasts and making pretexts for drunkenness, but it ordered that from the very beginning their upbringing should be in sober moderation. And it gave instruction to teach reading, in relation to the laws, and that they know about the exploits of their forebears, in order that they imitate the latter and, being brought up with the former, neither transgress nor have an excuse for ignorance.⁶⁶

Although such evidence seems impressive on the surface, Stanley notes that Catherine Hezser, based upon an extensive analysis of literary and inscriptional material in Roman Palestine, has proposed that “less than 10 percent of the Jewish population would have been able to read simple texts and sign their names throughout the imperial era.”⁶⁷ The multilingual literacy obtaining among the upper echelons of Jewish scribal society, in other words, would have rapidly dissipated to such an extent that the vast majority of Jews lacked any appreciable literary skills. Stanley's cautious endorsement of Hezser's assessment is reflected in the following remarks:

Perhaps the best that can be said at this point is that the evidence that has often been cited for widespread Jewish literacy in antiquity is questionable. Thus while it is quite reasonable to suppose that the Jewish members of Paul's churches would have been familiar with common biblical stories and key texts from their

⁶⁵ Those who make this claim include: Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 7; Fisk, “Synagogue Influence,” 79–180.

⁶⁶ Translation from John M. G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary* (ed. Steve Mason; vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 287, material in brackets mine. Cf. also *Ant.* 4.211; *Ag. Ap.* 2.178; *T. Levi* 13.2; Philo, *Legat.* 115, 210; as well as the sources cited in Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 249, n. 23.

⁶⁷ Stanley, “Paul's ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 139. Cf. Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 497–98. For a similar, even less sanguine, assessment of Jewish literacy, see the works by Meir Bar-Ilan listed in Stanley, “Paul's ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 138–39, n. 40.

experience in Jewish synagogues, it would be hazardous to assume that they were capable of reading the text of Scripture (or any other text) on their own.⁶⁸

The acknowledgment in the above quotation that Jewish members of Paul's churches, despite their illiteracy, could have been "familiar with common biblical stories and key texts from their experience in Jewish synagogues" is one of several places in which Stanley recognizes the distinction between *literacy*, understood as the ability to read and write, and *scriptural familiarity*, which could have come from repeated exposure to biblical texts in an oral environment as well as from reading those texts for oneself.⁶⁹ Elsewhere, however, Stanley seems to conflate the two. For example, following his rehearsal of Hays's metaleptic model in his 2008 essay, one in which he recognizes that Hays assumes "a fairly substantial knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures" on the part of Paul's audiences, Stanley nevertheless begins his critique by focusing on literacy and only subsequently mentions familiarity, or the lack thereof (i.e. ignorance):

In the first place, the idea that Paul's first-century audiences would have possessed the degree of biblical literacy presupposed by Hays's approach is historically implausible. Unless Paul's congregations were highly anomalous, the great majority of their members would have been illiterate and thus unable to read the Jewish Bible for themselves. His letters also suggest that most of his addressees came from non-Jewish (i.e. 'Gentile') backgrounds where many of them would have been ignorant of the content of the Jewish Scriptures.⁷⁰

The term *literacy* as utilized in Stanley's expression "biblical literacy," although soon associated with the ability to read (the issue discussed in the next sentence), initially

⁶⁸ Stanley, "Paul's 'Use' of Scripture," 139–40.

⁶⁹ See also (Stanley, "'Pearls Before Swine'," 130; idem, *Arguing*, 46, italics mine): "Whatever knowledge they [Paul's audiences] had concerning the content of the Jewish Scriptures would have come to them via oral instruction from the few literate and/or Jewish members of the congregation."

⁷⁰ Stanley, "Paul's 'Use' of Scripture," 132, 133, respectively.

connotes, if not denotes, familiarity, the kind of familiarity, in this case, that would enable one to reflect on the implicit parallels that are the essence of metalepsis. This term, in other words, has taken on a second sense: it is also understood as the ability to acquire and exercise scriptural familiarity. In fact, rooted in a conflation between these two distinct senses, literacy becomes the primary paradigm through which Stanley assesses Paul's audiences. The tension between this paradigmatic understanding and the distinct issue of textual familiarity is evident in this quotation from Stanley's 1999 article:

It is a truism that literate people wrote for other literate people in antiquity, but the significance of this observation for interpreting Paul's letters has often been overlooked. To put it simply, we may be asking too much of Paul if we expect him to speak in a way that even the illiterate members of his churches could understand everything he said. As an educated person in antiquity, Paul would naturally be concerned about how the literate people in his audience would respond to what he was saying, including his biblical quotations. The fact that his letters were written to be read aloud may have mitigated this concern somewhat, but the written format of the letter would have exercised an irresistible pull toward more literate modes of expression. In other words, Paul may have been speaking largely to the literate members of his congregations (or more precisely, to those who were familiar with the Jewish Scriptures) when he penned his biblical quotations.⁷¹

On the one hand, at the end of the quotation Stanley acknowledges that, precisely speaking, "those familiar with the Jewish Scriptures" are not to be equated with the "literate members" of Paul's congregations. On the other hand, the emphasis prior to this parenthetical acknowledgment is upon the paradigmatic place of literacy. Indeed, although Stanley recognizes that Paul's letters "were written to be read aloud," he nonetheless regards it as a "truism that literate people," like Paul, "wrote for other literate

⁷¹ Stanley, "'Pearls Before Swine,'" 135.

people,” with the written format of Paul’s letters exercising “an irresistible pull toward more literate modes of expression.” Even if those who were able to read and write in Paul’s congregations possessed a unique and important ability, one that would have served them well in assessing Paul’s use of scripture, the question is whether a different paradigm might not be more appropriate for an ancient society that even in its approach to reading and writing was dominated by orality. I shall return to this question.

Absence of Synagogue Influence and Presence of Guessing in Romans

The final objection to be considered relates to Romans in particular. In discussing the historical context of this letter, Stanley sides with the minimalists, who credit Paul with “very little knowledge of the situation in Rome,” or at least argue that “the letter provides too little information to form an opinion,” and he also urges caution about “assuming that the Gentile Christians in Rome had been associated with the Jewish synagogue prior to their conversion.”⁷² Although this cautionary approach seems to conflict with Paul’s clear assumption that “the Roman Christians will understand his many allusions to Jewish beliefs (the righteousness of God, the final judgment, the idea of atonement) and practices (circumcision, sacrifice, obedience to Torah)” to the extent that Paul’s “letter would make little sense to a person who knew nothing of these matters,” Stanley nonetheless suggests that the level of knowledge presupposed by Paul “does not exceed what the Romans could have gathered from common cultural experience with Jews and Judaism or the Jewish framework of Christian catechesis.”⁷³

⁷² Stanley, *Arguing*, 136–37. For an example of a maximalist approach to Romans, see Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).

⁷³ Stanley, *Arguing*, 138–39. The quotes at the end of the next paragraph come from *ibid.*, 141–42.

In terms of assessing the degree of biblical “literacy” (the second sense) reflected in Romans, Stanley acknowledges but attempts to minimize that Paul assumes familiarity with the Jewish scriptures that is quantitatively and qualitatively higher than in his other letters. Ultimately, Stanley regards it as “difficult to envision any culturally appropriate mechanism by which Paul could have learned precisely which passages of Scripture the Romans would recognize” and he concludes by suggesting that Paul’s scriptural references provide us with “little more than his best guess” as to what the Romans might have known, though “we should not simply presume that he guessed correctly.”

Critical Response

Before beginning my critical response, it should be acknowledged that Stanley, in answering Hays’s own call for “a broad historical construction” of the literary competence of Paul’s first-century readers (cf. p. 134 above), has made a significant contribution to scholarship by fostering a greater awareness of this matter as well as other ancient realities that may have prevented metaleptic resonances from being heard. In doing so, he has provided strong warrant for questioning the propriety of overly-sophisticated metaleptic proposals.⁷⁴ Some scholars, no doubt, will avoid the issue by adopting an exclusively author-centered approach to the Pauline letters, one that absolves them of the need to consider difficult questions about literary competence. If, however, it is to be maintained that Paul’s authorial intentions had any chance of being understood by those to whom his letters were originally written, then one must deal with Stanley’s objections. As it turns out, these objections may be countered by considering the critical

⁷⁴ See, for example, Moyise’s (“Quotations,” 22–24) discussion of Stanley’s objections in relation to Hays’s interpretation of Rom 2:24.

response of others to inaccessibility, the adequacy of literacy as the primary paradigm to evaluate the scriptural familiarity of an ancient audience, and the plausibility of Stanley's approach to Romans. We begin with the accessibility of texts, scriptural ones as well as those of Paul.

Accessibility

Appearing in the same volume as Stanley's 2008 essay is a discussion by Stanley E. Porter of the type of book culture that obtained around the time of Paul. Although not naming Stanley, Porter notes that in spite of the tendency "to dismiss such a notion on the basis of a purported widespread illiteracy, the supposed high cost of materials, and the lack of printing technology," there is nevertheless "ample evidence for a widespread book culture at that time."⁷⁵ "Without minimizing the importance of orality—or the fact that the major means of 'publication' was in terms of oral performance, such as orations, the reading of poetry, lectures delivered in public, and the theater," Porter chronicles impressive evidence for a "parallel book culture that was large and significant." In the second century CE, for example, before the use of the codex became widespread (i.e. scrolls were still the main medium employed), the production and sale of Galen forgeries, presumably due to demand, became so widespread that Galen himself felt compelled to write a tract entitled, *On His Own Books*, in which he listed and described his genuine works so as to distinguish them from false ones.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Porter, "Paul and His Bible," 107–8. This quotation and the one that follows.

⁷⁶ Bruce M. Metzger, "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha," *JBL* 91 (1972): 3–24[6]. Porter ("Paul and His Bible," 108) makes a slightly different point on the basis of this Galen example.

Viewed in light of this robust book culture, one that paralleled the predominant oral culture of the day, Stanley's arguments for inaccessibility may be adequately, if not easily, answered.⁷⁷ Regarding the supposed lack of chapter or verse divisions in scriptural texts, "most ancient manuscripts," in fact, "seem to have used some form of paragraphing, even if different systems were employed in different manuscripts."⁷⁸ This would have allowed for a certain facility in consulting them. Moreover, Luke 4:17 presents Jesus as finding a particular passage in an Isaiah scroll, without any hint that it was difficult for him to do so.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Somewhat counter-intuitive to his own portrayal of first-century book culture, Porter ("Paul and His Bible," 121) accepts Stanley's view that "it is highly unlikely that any one individual or establishment would have had access to the Greek Scriptures" and that "Poor relations between Paul and many of his fellow Jews may have further limited Paul's and his colleagues' access to the Greek Scriptures." These two claims are not only counter-intuitive to Porter's portrayal, but they also potentially exclude one another. If it was not possible for an establishment, like a synagogue, to acquire a substantial, even if not exhaustive, collection of biblical scrolls, then tensions with such establishments would not have been a significant factor in limiting the access of Paul and his colleagues. If, however, it was possible to acquire a substantial collection of biblical scrolls, then Paul and his own colleagues could have done so themselves, mitigating the tension argument. Both arguments are dealt with below.

⁷⁸ Abasciano ("Diamonds," 163, n. 41) attributes this insight to the expertise of Peter J. Williams and refers to the Pericope series published by Van Gorcum for evidence. Although written in Hebrew, the manuscript of 1QS, for example, dating to approximately 100 BCE, contains spatial as well as marginal indicators. See Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 14–15; James H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community* (Photographic Multi-Language ed.; Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996). The latter text allows one to see these spatial and marginal marks for oneself.

⁷⁹ I owe this reference to Abasciano ("Diamonds," 164), who also counters the argument that it would have been especially difficult to re-roll a papyrus scroll in the process of finding a passage, even though this argument is not made by Stanley. Abasciano, however, neglects to note that the particular passage in Isaiah to which Luke 4:17 refers is a conflation of Isa 61:1–2 and 58:6. This allows for the possibility that Jesus is reading from a scriptural anthology rather than an actual scroll of Isaiah. On the other hand, the Isaiah passage cited in Luke 4:17 may reflect the evangelist's attempt to distill the essence of a longer reading from Isaiah. In either case, Luke 4:17 must be regarded as a verisimilitudinous presentation of navigating a scroll.

As for possessing these manuscripts, cost would have been a limiting, though not insurmountable, factor for leather parchment⁸⁰ but not for papyrus. This “paper of the ancient world” was plentiful as well as inexpensive and the “cost of getting a book copied was not exorbitant, ranging from two to four drachmas, which is the equivalent of one to six day’s pay.”⁸¹ While this may have been a steep price for those on the lower end of the economic ladder to pay, it would not have prevented wealthier congregants, either individually or jointly, from acquiring them, thereby enabling the community access.⁸² Moreover, the private use of scriptural texts is depicted in 4 Macc 18:10–19 and Acts 8:27ff., not to mention 2 Tim 4:13, Paul’s request for Timothy to bring him: τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας (“the scrolls, especially the parchments”). This latter passage, even if post-Pauline, would have to have had some degree of verisimilitude to have been written in the first place.⁸³

The relatively low cost of papyrus scrolls mitigates the argument about tensions with the synagogue preventing access to the Jewish scriptures, since there is reason to suppose that the Pauline churches could have purchased their own copies. Yet, assuming,

⁸⁰ Abasciano (“Diamonds,” 156, n. 11), based on an estimate by Meier Bar-Ilan, notes that “a book of Torah could cost between 80 and 120 gold denarii.” With a denarius equaling approximately one day’s wage, such a sum would be extreme for the average individual but not impossible for a community, especially one with some wealthy members. To illustrate the ability of a community to pool together resources, Abasciano (ibid, 157) points to the fifty thousand silver drachmas worth of magic books burned by converts to Christianity in Ephesus, according to Acts 19:18–19. On the value of a drachma, see the immediately following sentence in text above.

⁸¹ Porter, “Paul and His Bible,” 109. On the low cost of papyrus, see also Abasciano (“Diamonds,” 160–61, n. 32) and the sources discussed there.

⁸² Stanley’s (“Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 141, n. 48) response to the relatively low cost of papyrus focuses on the individual without means and thereby neglects this communal dimension of Pauline churches.

⁸³ Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 99–100; Abasciano, “Diamonds,” 156–57.

for the sake of argument, that such costs would nonetheless have been prohibitive, tensions between church and synagogue would not, at least in the case of Rome, have been insuperable. Bruce N. Fisk observes that the consequence of the autonomous structure of synagogues in first century Rome, as opposed to the hierarchical order in Alexandria, is that whether Christian evangelists and missionaries “were welcomed or shunned, embraced or punished, would depend on dynamics and relations within each synagogue rather than on city-wide politics.”⁸⁴ Thus tensions with one synagogue community in Rome would not necessarily entail that others would deny Christians access to sacred texts.

As for the inaccessibility of Pauline letters due to “*the brief moment of oral recitation*,” Stanley’s understanding of the reception of ancient letters, in general, appears quite ahistorical. Concerning the preparation for the moment of reception, Pieter J. J. Botha notes the following:

There were no letter boxes in antiquity. A letter carrier did not simply deliver the letter. It had to be given to someone; the letter was probably discussed and it was physically handled by various people. Even if a letter was straightforwardly delivered, the receiver had to select the correct time to have it read. Since others were present, there must have been considerable interaction: getting together, waiting for each other; maybe some preparation of the audience. All this is simply ignored in our ‘reconstructions’.⁸⁵

Moreover, Stanley’s understanding of the reception of Pauline letters, in particular, appears quite ahistorical as well. Wagner responds with incredulity to the

⁸⁴ Fisk, “Synagogue Influence,” 175.

⁸⁵ “The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence,” in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht; JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 409–28[412]. Stanley (*Arguing*, 57, n. 50) refers to this article by Botha but does not seem to recognize the implications of this point for his own view.

suggestion that the only opportunity to hear a Pauline letter would have been during its one hearing in the assembly and he suggests instead that in the course of subsequent re-readings and ensuing discussion “Paul’s frequent references to Israel’s scriptures in Romans [may have] provoked some among his first hearers to *acquire* the familiarity with these sources necessary to grasp his argument fully.”⁸⁶

This is not mere speculation on Wagner’s part but is rooted in four more or less demonstrable facts about the reception of Romans. First, Paul’s communication with and commendation of his letter carriers, Phoebe in the case of Romans (16:1–2; cf. 1 Cor 4:16–17; 16:10–11; 2 Cor 8:16–24; Phil 2:19–24), would have allowed them to clarify various points made in the letters and answer questions.⁸⁷ Second, the delivery of Romans to the various house churches throughout Rome probably entailed copying the letter and discussion as well.⁸⁸ Regarding the latter, Wagner notes, “We know that the Corinthian assembly discussed Paul’s ‘prior letter’ at some length; when they could not agree on the meaning of Paul’s instructions or desired further clarification of some things he had said, they sent him a letter of their own (1 Cor 7:1; cf. 5:9–11).”⁸⁹ That Romans

⁸⁶ Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 37, italics his.

⁸⁷ Besides Wagner (*Heralds of the Good News*, 38), see John L. White, *Light From Ancient Letters* (Foundations and Facets: New Testament; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 216; Botha, “Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters,” 417–18; E. Randolph Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (WUNT 2/42; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991), 7–10; idem, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 202. Stanley (*Arguing*, 57, n. 50) concedes that “Paul’s letter carriers would have been present to answer questions about the content of his letters when they were read aloud to the initial audience,” but attempts to minimize this fact by arguing that the largely illiterate audience would have been unlikely to raise questions about Paul’s use of Scripture. This improperly applies the paradigm of *literacy* to the oral environment of the first century, as I shall argue in the next section.

⁸⁸ Cf. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 97.

⁸⁹ Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 37.

was preceded by discussion and likely would have occasioned further discussion, if not debate, is suggested by the blasphemous (in Paul's view) caricature of his gospel as teaching, ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ; ("Shall we do evil that good might come?") in Rom 3:8.

Third, exercise of the gift of teaching to which Paul refers (Rom 12:7; cf. 1 Cor 12:28–29; Eph 4:11; 1 Tim 3:2; 2 Tim 2:2, 24) would likely have involved exposition of the Jewish scriptures in light of Paul's explicit as well as implicit use of them in his letters. Finally, the preservation and early circulation of Romans, as well as 1 Corinthians, with localized references omitted (Rom 1:7, 15; 16:1ff.; 1 Cor 1:2) suggests that Pauline letters, these two in particular, were highly valued and seen to have universal significance.⁹⁰ In short, there would have been plenty of opportunity to digest their rich and sometimes bewildering contents (cf. 2 Pet 3:15–16) beyond the "*the brief moment of oral recitation*."⁹¹

Fluency

The picture that has emerged from responding to Stanley's arguments for inaccessibility is one rather of accessibility, accessibility not merely because scriptural scrolls could have been readily acquired and navigated, at least to some degree, but because the Pauline letters that so often offered interpretations of them, whether explicit or implicit, would have been the subject of repeated discussion. There was, in other

⁹⁰ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 98.

⁹¹ That Stanley ("Pearls Before Swine," 130; cf. idem, *Arguing*, 46) himself recognized the implausibility of this characterization, perhaps due to the criticisms of Wagner just enumerated, is suggested by the absence of the paragraph in which it appears from his 2004 revision even though the surrounding text remains the same.

words, a primarily oral, as opposed to exclusively literary, component to their reception.

This oral aspect was not unique to Paul's letters but was a standard feature of the manner in which almost all literature was produced, through dictation to a scribe, as well as read, usually out loud and often in a public context. As Botha observes, "written correspondence was essentially dependent on orality. Whether creating a letter or receiving it, oral-aural aspects were part and parcel of the whole process."⁹²

Accordingly, listeners, whether literate or not, would have been accustomed to hearing a text read and absorbing its contents. Such absorption was facilitated by "methods of organization ... based on sound rather than on sight."⁹³ In terms of auditory markers in Rom 1:18–32, for example, Paul J. Achtemeier notes that the third and final repetition of παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός ("God gave them over," v. 28; cf. vv. 24, 26) "is least emphatic in its position, indicating to the listeners that the series has now come to an end and preparing them for a new stage in the argument, namely, a list of vices," which, though without a discernible pattern initially, finishes with "four alliterative adjectives," ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους ἀστόργους ἀνελεήμονας ("senseless, faithless, loveless, merciless"), signaling, it seems, once more to the listeners that now this list "is coming

⁹² Botha, "Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters," 417. On the role of orality in the NT as a whole, see especially Paul J. Achtemeier, "*Omne verbum sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity," *JBL* 109 (1990): 3–27. Achtemeier (*ibid.*, 17, italics his), however, goes too far when he claims "Reading was ... oral performance *whenever* it occurred and in whatever circumstance" and that "Late antiquity knew nothing of the 'silent, solitary reader.'" This was shown by Frank D. Gilliard ("More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non omne verbum sonabat*," *JBL* 112 [1993]: 689–94) who refers to Cicero's *Tusc.* 5.116, among other texts, to illustrate the presence of silent reading in antiquity. Gilliard (*ibid.*, 694) nonetheless acknowledges Achtemeier's main contention: "There is abundant evidence that 'we have in the culture of late Western antiquity a culture of high residual orality which nevertheless communicated significantly by means of literary creations.'" Cf. Porter, "Paul and His Bible," 117–18.

⁹³ Achtemeier, "*Omne*," 18–19.

to an end.”⁹⁴ While I would part company with Achtemeier by incorporating the vice list into the final section begun by the giving-over clause and stress that παρέδωκεν αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός derives from Ps 106(105):41a, his observation regarding auditory markers stands. In fact, in words that sound like they could have come from Hays himself, Achtemeier concludes, “The ancient ‘reader,’” and we might add correspondingly the ancient hearer, “will have been more attuned to what one may call ‘acoustic echo’”⁹⁵

It is the predominance of this oral dimension to the reception of written works that allows scholars to draw a distinction in the ancient world between being literate (i.e. able to read and write) and being educated or familiar with texts and traditions. No doubt literacy would have been a tremendous asset in this regard, but it was not a necessary requirement. This point is made repeatedly by Gamble, one of Stanley’s own sources. For example, having earlier asserted that “in antiquity one could hear texts read even if one was unable to read, so that illiteracy was no bar to familiarity with Christian writings” and that “acquaintance with the scriptures did not require that all or even most Christians be individually capable of reading them,” Gamble expands on this disjunction between literacy and familiarity as follows:

It may seem paradoxical to say both that Christianity placed a high value on texts and that most Christians were unable to read, but in the ancient world this was no contradiction. In Greco-Roman [urban] society the illiterate had access to literacy in a variety of public settings. Recitations of poetry and prose works, dramatic performances in theaters and at festivals, declamations in high rhetorical style, street-corner philosophical diatribes, commemorative inscriptions, the posting and

⁹⁴ Achtemeier, “*Omne*,” 23, 25 respectively.

⁹⁵ “*Omne*,” 19. Achtemeier (ibid, 19, n. 119) attributes this “particularly apposite phrase” to Eric A. Havelock, “Oral Composition in the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles,” *New Literary History* 16 (1984): 175–97[187].

reading of official decrees, the routine traffic of legal and commercial documents all brought the fruits of literacy before the general population, educating the public in its uses and popularizing its conventions. Among the literate as well, it was as common to be read to as to read for oneself in the ancient world. Besides, the papyri show that many illiterates had recourse to professional scribes for the composition of letters and contracts, and many of the epitaphs surviving from Greek and Roman antiquity were commissioned on behalf of the illiterate. They were not, then, barred from the practical benefits of literacy nor from an acquaintance with the substance of texts.

... Thus, although the limited extent of individual literacy certainly had a bearing on the composition, transcription, private use, and authoritative interpretation of Christian texts, it had little adverse effect on the ability of Christians generally to gain a close acquaintance with Christian literature. The illiterate Christian found in the public reading of Christian texts at least as large and probably a more consistent opportunity than his pagan counterpart to participate in literacy and become familiar with texts.⁹⁶

Although Stanley, as we have seen, acknowledges the distinction between literacy and textual familiarity, he does not follow Gamble in regarding limited individual literacy levels as having had “little adverse effect on the ability of Christians generally to gain a close acquaintance with Christian literature.” According to Stanley, Gamble’s stance in this respect is possible only because, as indicated at the end of the quote above, “Gamble assumes that the Jewish Scriptures were read aloud in Christian worship,” an assumption that “may have been true for the second century and later,” but cannot be retrojected “into Paul’s first-century churches without supporting evidence.”⁹⁷

At this point, Stanley manifests what Abasciano describes as a “minimalistic historical methodology,” one that regards the absence of evidence as the evidence of

⁹⁶ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 4, 5, 8–9 respectively, with material in brackets mine. See also pp. 10, 205. Similarly, Botha (“Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters,” 414): “We must remind ourselves that the connection between education and literacy, which seems so natural to us, is simply a cultural convention of our own times. In Graeco-Roman societies one could be educated without having the ability to read and write.” Cf. further Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 37; Abasciano, “Diamonds,” 165–67.

⁹⁷ Stanley, *Arguing*, 46, n. 27.

absence.⁹⁸ Moreover, he is wrong. Gamble does provide supporting evidence. Based upon the “clearly established custom” of Torah reading in the synagogue by the first century (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.175; Acts 13:14–15; 15:21) and Christianity’s Jewish roots, Gamble argues “it is likely that the customs of the synagogue influenced Christian liturgical practice” in this respect, with “the presence by the mid-second century of prayer, scripture reading and homily in the *synaxis* of Christian assemblies, mirroring both the structure and the elements of the synagogue service” bearing this out.⁹⁹ In relation to Paul, in particular, Gamble observes, “Paul’s claim in 2 Cor. 3.12–16 that when Jews read the old covenant (i.e., in the synagogue) ‘a veil lies over their minds’ but that for Christians ‘the veil is removed’ seems pointless unless scripture is publicly read among Christians.”¹⁰⁰ Additionally, he suggests, “It is probably not fortuitous that the first explicit mention of the liturgical reading of scripture in Christianity (1 Tim. 4:13) appears in a letter that stands in the Pauline tradition and presupposes the practice of churches in the Pauline mission field.”¹⁰¹

There is, then, every reason to suppose that Paul’s largely Gentile and largely illiterate audiences would have been exposed to weekly readings of and discussions about scriptural texts. Illiterate Gentile Christians may not have had the benefit, as Stanley himself observes, of being “trained to know the content of their Scriptures from

⁹⁸ Abasciano, “Diamonds,” 161, 166, n. 51.

⁹⁹ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 211, 213 respectively. See also Rev 22:18–19, which presupposes the public reading of Revelation.

¹⁰⁰ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 325, n. 30.

¹⁰¹ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 213.

childhood,” as their literate and illiterate Jewish counterparts did.¹⁰² Nevertheless, the likelihood that many of them had previously been associated with the synagogue as God-fearers or that, if not, they would have had considerable experience hearing texts read simply by virtue of their participation in Greco-Roman society, suggests that individually they would have been able to achieve, at least, modest scriptural familiarity and jointly, especially through dialogue with Jewish and/or knowledgeable literate members, even significant acquaintance.

The power of oral exposure over time to inculcate scriptural familiarity among the largely illiterate is suggested by the implied audiences of Second Temple Jewish literature in general. Consider *Wisdom*, for example. James M. Reese notes that “The author presupposes a thorough knowledge of Jewish history and tradition,” carefully avoiding “the mention of any proper names except for two authentic Greek forms, namely the Red Sea (10.18; 19.7) and the Pentapolis (10.6), a place name not found in the actual biblical account (see Gen 19.22).”¹⁰³ In *Wis* 11–19 alone, allusive reference is made to numerous passages from *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Numbers*, at times interpreted through the lens of tradition (cf. e.g. *Wis* 14:6; *Gen* 6:1–4; *1 En.* 6.1ff.), with the assumption that the Jewish Diaspora audience for whom this text was intended would have understood and appreciated this subtlety.

¹⁰² Stanley, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 140, n. 46. Stanley’s dismissal in the same footnote of “how much an audience might be able to absorb and memorize as a result of weekly exposure to oral readings from Scripture” is based upon an anachronistic comparison with “the massive biblical illiteracy that characterizes many contemporary Christian churches.” Anyone who has frequented contemporary Christian churches, especially ones with a “contemporary” approach to worship, knows that often the actual content of the scriptures figures peripherally, if at all, in the course of the service.

¹⁰³ James M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (AnBib 41; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970), 144.

Ultimately, the problem with Stanley's approach is the paradigm of literacy itself.

This is distinct from the issue of ancient literacy. Stanley is right to call attention to the small percentage of people in the ancient world who would have been able to read and write as a factor to consider in assessing Hays's metaleptic proposal and its subsequent development by Watson. Even if the literacy rates suggested by Harris, Gamble, and Hezser are lower than what subsequent studies might show, there is no question that illiteracy was the norm. Yet, this fact ought to push scholars, such as Stanley, to reflect on the power of orality to educate, a power presupposed in Paul's implied audiences as well as those of other Second Temple Jewish writings, like Wisdom. Instead, Stanley improperly conflates literacy (understood as the ability to read and write) with literacy (understood as the ability to acquire and exercise textual familiarity) and in so doing anachronistically imposes the paradigm of *literacy* on ancient audiences who lived, moved, and had their being in the predominantly oral environment of the first century.

In fairness to Stanley, Hays encourages the application of a literacy paradigm to his proposal since metalepsis, in its conception, is a literary technique and accordingly Hays often speaks of "readers," whether ancient or contemporary.¹⁰⁴ Nonetheless, Hays does not do so exclusively (cf. the quote on p. 134, which refers to "readers/hearers") and, more importantly, the pervasive term "echo" is an auditory one. I suggest, then, that a more appropriate paradigm for assessing the capabilities of ancient audiences with regard to written texts and one that coheres well with Hays's metaleptic proposal is *fluency*. Unlike literacy, this paradigm is oriented to the oral dimension, though it may

¹⁰⁴ Stanley ("Paul's 'Use' of Scripture," 129, n. 13, 131) draws attention to this very matter.

include the written as well. One can, for example, be fluent in a spoken language but not able to read and write; alternatively, fluency can be conceptualized so as to include skills in reading and writing as well.

If Paul's audiences had developed a certain degree of fluency in the language, symbols, and traditions of the biblical texts, irrespective of their literacy skills, then they would have been able to understand instantly, at least some, if not many, of his marked and unmarked references to the Jewish scriptures, just as many scholars, if this chapter was read to them, could immediately recognize that I concluded the paragraph before the preceding one with an unmarked allusion to the words attributed to Paul in Acts 17:28a: ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν ("for in him we live and move and are"). With further reflection, a smaller percentage of scholars could have recognized that the words of Paul to which I alluded are themselves possibly an unmarked citation of Epimenides, followed by a marked citation of Aratus, both in a speech that illustrates the very matter we have been discussing: the interplay between literacy and orality in the first century.¹⁰⁵ I conclude that, in light of the paradigm of fluency, the scriptural knowledge assumed by scholarly consensus for Paul's implied audiences is appropriately suited to what his actual audiences could have collectively obtained through the process of letter-reception in the first century. The misjudgment, then, seems to have been made by Stanley.

¹⁰⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 610–11), for example, disputes the unmarked citation of Epimenides while endorsing the marked citation from Aratus. See his discussion and the literature to which he refers.

Presence of Synagogue Influence and Absence of Guessing in Romans

The plausibility of Stanley's approach to Romans is open to question at numerous points. To begin with, it is inconsistent with what he says elsewhere. As we have seen, Stanley attempts to remove the apparent conflict between affirming, on the one hand, that one should not assume "Gentile Christians in Rome had been associated with the Jewish synagogue prior to their conversion," and, on the other hand, that Paul clearly presupposes "the Roman Christians will understand his many allusions to Jewish beliefs (the righteousness of God, the final judgment, the idea of atonement) and practices (circumcision, sacrifice, obedience to Torah)" to such an extent that his "letter would make little sense to a person who knew nothing of these matters."¹⁰⁶ His solution is to suggest that the level of knowledge presupposed by Paul "does not exceed what the Romans could have gathered from common cultural experience with Jews and Judaism or the Jewish framework of Christian catechesis." Yet, God's righteousness, final judgment, atonement, circumcision, sacrifice, Torah obedience, especially in the manner Paul discusses them, are all scriptural concepts. Moreover, Stanley elsewhere asserts that while "non-Jews were familiar with Jewish beliefs and practices, including their reverence for a collection of holy texts," non-Jews "did not (so far as we know) read the Jewish Scriptures for themselves," evidenced by the fact that "Even the literati of Greco-Roman society had wild ideas about the content of the Jewish Scriptures...."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ Stanley, *Arguing*, 136–37. The quote that follows comes from *ibid.*, 138–39.

¹⁰⁷ Stanley, "'Pearls Before Swine,'" 130, n. 18; *idem*, *Arguing*, 45, n. 24.

It would seem, then, to avoid inconsistency Stanley must assume that the seemingly extensive knowledge of the Roman Christians derives from the “Jewish framework of Christian catechesis.” There are, however, still two problems for Stanley with this position. First, it would amount to acknowledging that “literate members” of the churches in Rome “made a practice of teaching their illiterate brothers and sisters the content of the Jewish Scriptures,” something Stanley, though without particularly strong reason, dismisses in another place as anachronistic.¹⁰⁸ Thus the inconsistency in Stanley’s thought would simply be shifted. Second, and more important for my purposes, is that to subscribe to a Jewish framework for Christian catechesis would, in effect, acknowledge the influence of the synagogue, even if indirectly, on the formation of Roman Christianity, undermining Stanley’s own caution.

As it turns out, the influence of the synagogue on Roman Christianity is virtually certain. Fisk, who rejects the theory of an expulsion of Jews under Claudius, argues extensively for the synagogue as the matrix of early Roman Christianity,¹⁰⁹ as does Peter Lampe, who accepts the expulsion theory. Lampe, for example, notes that “In the urban Roman history of theology of the first century, a broad stream of tradition from the synagogue plays a role.”¹¹⁰ He then refers to numerous OT and post-canonical Jewish traditions utilized by the Gentile author of *1 Clement*, such as Isaac’s knowing and willing submission to being sacrificed (cf. *1 Clem.* 31.3; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.232ff.).

¹⁰⁸ Stanley, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 140. Stanley’s dismissal is directed specifically at Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 33–39.

¹⁰⁹ Fisk, “Synagogue Influence,” 171–83.

¹¹⁰ Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (trans. Michael Steinhauser; ed. Marshall D. Johnson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 75.

Although unmentioned by Lampe, it is common to regard *1 Clem.* 7.5; 27.5 as citations of or allusions to Wis 12:10, 12 respectively. These texts are as follows:

Table 7. *1 Clement* and Wisdom of Solomon Parallels

<i>1 Clem.</i> 7.5	Wis 12:10
⁵ διέλθωμεν εἰς τὰς γενεὰς πάσας καὶ καταμάθωμεν ὅτι ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν.	¹⁰ κρίνων δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἐδίδους τόπον μετανοίας οὐκ ἄγνοων ὅτι πονηρὰ ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔμφυτος ἡ κακία αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀλλαγῇ ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
⁵ Let us pass through every generation and observe that from generation to generation the Master has granted a place of repentance to those willing to be converted to him.	¹⁰ But judging [them] little by little you granted a place of repentance , although you were not unaware that their origin was wicked and their evil implanted and their reasoning would by no means change forever.

<i>1 Clem.</i> 27.5	Wis 12:12
⁵ Τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ Τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ; ὅτε θέλει καὶ ὡς θέλει ποιήσει πάντα καὶ οὐδὲν μὴ παρέλθῃ τῶν δεδογματισμένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.	¹² τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ Τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου; τίς δὲ ἐγκαλέσει σοὶ κατὰ ἐθνῶν ἀπολωλότων ἃ σὺ ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς εἰς κατάστασίν σοι ἐλεύσεται ἐκδικος κατὰ ἀδίκων ἀνθρώπων;
⁵ Who shall say to him, “ What have you done? ” Or “ Who shall oppose the power of his strength?” When he wills and as he wills, he shall do all and not one of the things he has decreed shall pass away.	¹² For who shall say , “ What have you done? ” Or “ Who shall oppose your judgment?” And “Who shall accuse you for the destruction of nations which you made?” Or “Who shall come to you as an appointed avenger for unjust humanity?”

Significant for the larger context I sketch in chapter six, this seems to establish the presence and influence of Wisdom in the Roman Christian community by the end of the first century, the traditional date for *1 Clement*. Lampe rightly concludes:

Christians from the sphere of influence of the synagogues, Jewish Christians as well as Gentile Christians, exercised an astonishing influence on the formation of

theology in urban Roman Christianity in the first century. These Christians from the sphere of influence of the synagogues presumably formed the majority. Most Christians of the first generation, at least before their conversion, would have had contacts with a synagogue. As *sebomenoi* or as members of Judaism, they would in varied intensity have taken in its wealth of ideas.¹¹¹

With such a strong degree of synagogue influence on Gentile as well as Jewish Christians, we may presume that Paul's diverse and subtle appeals to the scriptures in Romans would not have fallen on deaf ears. This presumption has consequences I shall develop in chapter six. As for a "culturally appropriate mechanism by which Paul could have learned precisely which passages of Scripture the Romans would recognize," besides Stanley's educated guess proposal, consider this possibility: Perhaps through informants like Priscilla and Aquila (cf. Rom 16:3), Paul was aware that traditions reflected in Wisdom were influential in the churches of Rome. More specifically, Paul may have learned that the understanding of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19, one rooted in the interpretation of well known texts regarding the plague traditions and wilderness wanderings, in general, and an apologetic construal of the golden calf incident, in particular (an especially sensitive subject due to the widespread tendency to confuse Jews with animal-worshipping Egyptians), had been fostering a sense of ethnic superiority among certain Jewish Christians in Rome. The sense of superiority, in turn, brought these Jewish Christians into conflict with Gentile Christians and even perhaps other Jewish Christians as well as Jews who subscribed to a different understanding of identity rooted in Pss 105(104)–107(106). This, of course, is to assume the larger context I intend to

¹¹¹ Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 76, italics his.

sketch in chapter six. Nevertheless, the plausibility of this assumption against the background of synagogue-influenced Roman Christianity should not go unnoticed.

Moreover, the long history of scholars recognizing some kind of relationship between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis 13–15, whether shared traditions or literary dependence, should also be noted. At the very least, such shared traditions would have formed part of the scripturally-influenced language that Roman Christians heard, thought, and spoke (cf. e.g. *Let. Aris.* 128–171; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81). This would have enabled immediate recognition of allusions to, or significant inversions of, these patterns of speech. Stanley, however, omits from any consideration the possible influence of “Jewish interpretive traditions” because it “overcomplicates” his model “by introducing additional variables into the equation.”¹¹² Although Stanley’s focus is limited to biblical quotations, this is nonetheless yet one more weakness of an approach to Romans that, in the end, proves to be internally inconsistent, historically questionable, and methodologically incomplete.¹¹³

Appreciative Appropriation: Orality and Excerpts

This lengthy critical response to Stanley’s objections does not, however, preclude appreciative appropriation. First, in responding to Stanley’s improper adoption of a literacy paradigm, an adoption that Hays’s own repeated references to “readers” encourages, we have seen that metalepsis needs to be reconceptualized in light of the oral/aural environment of the first century. I have proposed that the paradigm of fluency is more appropriate to this context, allows for an adequate match between Paul’s

¹¹² Stanley, *Arguing*, 70, n. 13.

¹¹³ Stanley (*Arguing*, 175; *Paul*, 73) in at least two places essentially endorses, even if unwittingly, Watson’s notion of complex conversation between Paul, the Jewish scriptures, and other interpreters.

scripturally-conversant implied and actual audiences, especially in Rome, and coheres well with metalepsis, given the pervasive use of the term “echo.” It must be noted that this important reconceptualization would not have occurred without Stanley’s objections. In that sense, he is to be credited with indirectly strengthening the methodological approach employed in this study.

Second, Stanley’s suggestion that Paul, as well as members of his congregations, sometimes utilized excerpts and anthologies in their study of biblical texts seems very likely, especially in light of the diversity of text-types reflected in Paul’s letters.¹¹⁴ This need not imply, however, that the original context was always lost in such excerpts and anthologies.¹¹⁵ The anthologies, for example, could have included interpretive commentary that actually mediated the context, as Stanley also seems to allow when he suggests that, at times, Paul “may even have included brief annotations to remind himself of how certain verses might be integrated into a later sermon or letter.”¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ According to Porter (“Paul and His Bible,” 123), “It is ... worth considering whether Paul had a scroll of Psalms, or at least an anthology that included significant Psalms excerpts, in front of him when he wrote Rom 3:10–18,” a passage containing “citations from Ps 14:1–3 in Rom 3:10–12; Ps 5:9 in Rom 3:13; Ps 10:7 in Rom 3:14; and Ps 36:1 in Rom 3:18, all reflecting various features of the Greek version that differ from the Hebrew.”

¹¹⁵ For a response to Stanley’s (“‘Pearls Before Swine,’” 137; cf. idem, *Arguing*, 53) charge that “Paul often quotes from Scripture in a way that bears little clear relation to the ‘original sense’ of the passage,” see Abasciano’s (“Diamonds,” 173–77) discussion of Paul’s use of Ps 116(115):10(1) in 2 Cor 4:13.

¹¹⁶ Stanley, *Paul*, 74. Florian Wilk (“The Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* [ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 253–71[261]) neglects this possibility that excerpts and anthologies could have included interpretive commentary mediating the context when he argues that Paul’s use of anthology “seems unlikely” because “the context around nearly every citation includes phrases and statements that are reminiscent of the contexts to which the passages originally belong.”

Moreover, we know from Qumran that excerpts sometimes included entire psalms (e.g. 4QPs^{g,h}: Ps 119), or even groups of psalms (4QPs^b: Pss 91, 94; 99, 100; 102, 103, 112, 113; 116, 117, 118).¹¹⁷ While these excerpted psalms seemed to have been used for liturgical purposes in Qumran, “Most classical excerpted texts in poetry and prose were made for educational purposes, illustrating a certain topic or idea (virtues, richness, women, etc.).”¹¹⁸ The two purposes, of course, are not mutually exclusive. In any case, it is at least possible that excerpted texts of Pss 105(104)–107(106), because of their overarching summary of biblical history, could have been employed for liturgical and/or educational purposes in synagogue settings, perhaps in Rome, a practice that would have subsequently been adopted by early converts to Christianity.¹¹⁹

Although the separation of Ps 105 from Pss 106–107 in the psalms manuscript 11QPs^a, a text to which I shall return, counts against this suggestion, it is nevertheless intriguing to observe that Pss 105(104)–107(106) seem to have been “known as a group to the author of the Benedictus.”¹²⁰ The relevant parallels with Luke 1:68–79 are as follows:

¹¹⁷ Emanuel Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 581–600[590, 597]; George J. Brooke, “The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 5–24[7–8].

¹¹⁸ Tov, “Excerpted,” 598. Tov (*ibid.*, 598, n. 68) cites as classical examples Pap. Hibeh 7 (3rd century BCE), Pap. Petrie I,3, and Pap. Tebt. I,1-2 (100 BCE).

¹¹⁹ This possibility is supported by George J. Brooke’s (“Psalms 105 and 106 at Qumran,” *RevQ* 14 [1989]: 267–92[272]) observation that at Qumran 4Q504 “may have been a weekly liturgical recollection of creation, the patriarchal episodes, the exodus from Egypt, the covenant at Horeb (Frg. 3, II, 13), the wilderness rebellions (especially recalling the language of *Numbers* 14; Frgs. 1-2, I, 8-10, II, 7-10, Frg. 6, 10-14), leading up to *Psalms* of confession and praise akin to *Daniel* 9 and *Nehemiah* 9 together with some element of the *Psalms* of praise (105, 106, 145-150, *1 Chronicles* 16).”

¹²⁰ Brooke, “Psalms 105 and 106,” 281.

Table 8. Luke 1:68–79 and Pss 105(104)–107(106) Parallels

Luke 1:68a		Ps 106(105):48	
^{68a} Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,		⁴⁸ Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ....	
^{68a} Blessed be the LORD God of Israel,		⁴⁸ Blessed be the LORD God [of] Israel....	

Luke 1:68b		Ps 106(105):4	
^{68b} ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ,		⁴ ἐπίσκεψαι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σου	
^{68b} for he has visited and brought redemption to his people,		⁴ to visit us with your salvation	

Luke 1:71		Ps 106(105):10	
⁷¹ σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς,		¹⁰ καὶ ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς μισούντων καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθροῦ·	
⁷¹ salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all those who hate us,		¹⁰ and he saved them from the hand of those who hate [them] and redeemed them from the hand of the enemy:	

Luke 1:72–73		Ps 105(104):8–10		Ps 106(105):45	
⁷² ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ,		⁸ ἐμνήσθη εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διαθήκης αὐτοῦ, λόγου, οὗ ἐνετείλατο εἰς χιλίας γενεάς,		⁴⁵ καὶ ἐμνήσθη τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ καὶ μετεμελήθη κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ....	
⁷³ ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν....		⁹ ὃν διέθετο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τοῦ ὅρκου αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ ¹⁰ καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτὴν τῷ Ἰακώβ εἰς πρόσταγμα καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διαθήκην αἰώνιον....			
⁷² to show mercy to our fathers and to remember his holy covenant ,		⁸ he remembers his covenant forever, the word which he commanded for a thousand generations,		⁴⁵ and he remembered his covenant	
⁷³ the oath he swore to Abraham our father, to give to us....		⁹ which he arranged with Abraham and his oath with Isaac ¹⁰ and he established it with Jacob for an ordinance and with Israel for an eternal covenant....		and relented according to the multitude of his mercy	

Luke 1:79		Ps 107(106):10	
⁷⁹ ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις,		¹⁰ καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, πεπεδημένους ἐν πτωχείᾳ καὶ σιδήρῳ,	
⁷⁹ to come to light to those seated in darkness and in the shadow of death,		¹⁰ Seated in darkness and in the shadow of death, shackled in poverty and iron,	

Certainly some of these parallels are more convincing than others. Besides Ps 106(105):48, for example, the phrase, Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς [τοῦ] Ἰσραήλ (“Blessed be the LORD God [of] Israel”), is also found in 1 Sam 25:32; 1 Kgs 1:48; 8:15; 2 Chron 2:11; 6:4; Pss 41(40):14; 72(71):18 (cf. Ps 89[88]:53). Considered on its own, then, the appearance of this phrase in Luke 1:68a could have come from any one of these texts or could simply be explained as an instance of generalized biblical speech. Similarly, Luke 1:72–73 shares affinities with Exod 2:24 and Lev 26:42, in addition to Pss 105(104):8–10; 106(105):45. Nevertheless, considered as a whole, these parallels provide important corroboration for the suggestion that Pss 105(104)–107(106), excerpted as a group, could have served a liturgical and/or pedagogical function within earliest Christianity, and within Judaism. If Pss 105(104)–107(106) did play such a role, then this fact, along with the circulation of Wisdom among the Roman Jewish and Christian communities, might have formed part of the larger context that Paul sought to address in Rom 1:18–2:11. I shall consider this possibility in chapter six.

Literary and Linguistic Atmosphere

Literary Atmosphere: Textual Fluidity in the Post-Qumran Era

Having endorsed in the preceding section the suggestion of Christopher D. Stanley that Paul and his congregations may have utilized excerpts and anthologies, we turn now to consider the state of scriptural texts in the first century as well as the language of the biblical texts employed by Paul, including our access to those texts through contemporary critical editions. We begin with textual fluidity in the Post-Qumran era.

According to Natalio Fernández Marcos, “Only H. M. Orlinsky dared to state, before 1950, that the Hebrew manuscripts used by the translators of the LXX in some books such as Job, Jeremiah or Esther differed *recensionally*, and not only in small details, from the Masoretic textual tradition, and then add that these traditions perished some time ago.”¹²¹ The Qumran finds beginning in the late 1940s, however, would remove such scholarly reticence, greatly enhancing our understanding of the LXX in the process.¹²² Along with the recovery of Greek biblical papyri not preserved by Christians, of which we had only two prior to Qumran (Rahlfs 957, 848), there were also discovered new originals in Hebrew or Aramaic, unknown until then (e.g. for the book of Tobit), Hebrew variant readings that differed from the *textus receptus* but agreed with the LXX (e.g. 4QDeut^d contains Hebrew readings for the form of Deut 32 found in the LXX tradition), and also fragments of different Hebrew recensions from those found in the *textus receptus* (e.g. a Hebrew recension of Jeremiah close to the *Vorlage* used for the LXX).¹²³

The picture that has emerged as a consequence of Qumran is one of textual fluidity within the first century. This fluidity, however, should not be exaggerated. The texts recovered at Qumran as well as Naḥal Ḥever support the thesis of Paul de Lagarde

¹²¹ Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 70, italics his. Cf. Harry M. Orlinsky, “On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies,” *JAOS* 61 (1941): 81–91[85–86].

¹²² References to the “LXX” or “Septuagint” in this study refer to the original Greek translation of the particular biblical book in question, what is sometimes referred to as the “Old Greek,” or “OG.” On the need for clarity in the use of such terminology, see Leonard Greenspoon, “The Use and Abuse of the Term ‘LXX’ and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship,” *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 21–29; R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 5–9.

¹²³ Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 70–74.

about an initial Greek translation of each biblical book, followed by plurality, as opposed to the view of Paul Kahle, which posits an initial pluralism.¹²⁴ Moreover, Stanley's extensive study of Pauline quotations

seems to support the emerging consensus that sees (a) a single primary Greek translation for each book of the Jewish Scriptures circulating alongside (b) one or more thorough revisions of that primary version, accompanied by (c) an indeterminate number of manuscripts that had experienced more sporadic 'corrections' designed either to bring the wording of the text into line with a particular Hebrew *Vorlage* or to improve the Greek style of the original.¹²⁵

Linguistic Atmosphere

Paul's Greek Text

Paul's interaction with the Jewish scriptures must be set within this broader context of limited textual fluidity. Complicating matters still further is that the one who describes himself as a "Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil 3:3) probably possessed linguistic competence in Hebrew/Aramaic and thus would have been able to interact with biblical texts in their Greek and Semitic forms.¹²⁶ A study of Paul's citations, including those in the disputed epistles, provides initial support for bilingual interaction with the Jewish scriptures. Out of the 107 citations, 42 agree with the LXX and MT, 7 with the MT against the LXX, and 17 with the LXX against the MT, while 10 are debated.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 71–72. On de Lagarde's and Kahle's theories as well as the mediating view of Elias J. Bickerman, see also Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Martin Jan Mulder; CRINT 2/1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 161–88[165–68].

¹²⁵ Stanley, *Paul*, 340.

¹²⁶ See Porter, "Paul and His Bible," 99–105.

¹²⁷ Moisés Silva, "Old Testament in Paul," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 631.

Nonetheless, the consensus of scholarship, at least since Emil Kautzsch's 1869 *De*

Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo Apostolo allegatis,¹²⁸ is that the evidence from Paul's letters suggests that he interacted primarily, if not exclusively, with the LXX. Especially in the post-Qumran era, the texts agreeing with the MT against the LXX are explained as due to Paul's reliance on Hebraizing revisions of the Greek text.¹²⁹

This consensus has even withstood the recent challenge by Timothy H. Lim.

According to Lim,

Reference to the MT or Qumran biblical manuscripts written in Hebrew is essential if the Pauline variants are to be properly evaluated, for once it is recalled that Paul was a polylingual Jew of the Graeco-Roman world, fluent or at least competent in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, there opens up a range of possibilities beyond the intra-Greek developments of the Septuagint and its revisions.¹³⁰

One of the Pauline texts Lim discusses is the citation of Isa 65:1 in Rom 10:20. Paul's cited version, the LXX, and the MT are as follows:

Table 9. Isa 65:1 and Rom 10:20 Parallels

MT Isa 65:1	LXX Isa 65:1	Rom 10:20
<p>¹ נדרשתי ללוא שאֵלו נמצאתי ללא בקשני אמרתי הנני הנני אל־גוי לא־קרא בשמי</p>	<p>¹ Ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν· εἶπα Ἰδοὺ εἰμι, τῷ ἔθνει οἷ οὐκ</p>	<p>²⁰ Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει· εὐρέθην [ἐν] τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ</p>

¹²⁸ Wilk ("Letters of Paul," 253, n. 1) credits Kautzsch with establishing this consensus. Stanley (*Paul*, 6, n. 10) also mentions the 1650 study by L. Capellus as well as the 1827 study by G. Roepe.

¹²⁹ On Hebraizing revisions of the Old Greek text, see the seminal work of Dominique Barthélemy (*Les devanciers d'Aquila* [VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963]) analyzing finds from Nahal Hever. For a critique of Barthélemy's proposal that the *kaige* texts and LXX Psalms were linked, a proposal elaborated upon by his student Hermann-Josef Venetz (*Die Quinta des Psalteriums: Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung* [Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974], 80–84), see the discussion and associated bibliography in Jannes Smith, "A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the Hallelouia Psalms of the Septuagint" (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005), 5–6.

¹³⁰ Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 148.

	ἐκάλεσάν μου τὸ ὄνομα.	μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν.
¹ I was inquired about by those who did ask, I was found by those who did not seek me. I said, “Behold me, Behold me, to a nation who did not call my name.”	¹ I became manifest to those who did not seek me; I was found by those who did not ask for me: I said, “Behold, I am to a nation who did not call my name.”	²⁰ And Isaiah is daring and says: “ <i>I was found by those who did not seek me; I became manifest to those who did not ask for me.</i> ”

As Lim observes, the LXX and MT versions suggest that the phrases *εὐρέθην* (“I was found”) and *ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην* (“I became manifest”) may have been reversed by Paul himself. More importantly for our purposes, Lim further observes that the argument that Paul’s scriptural text was Greek, rather than Hebrew, because of the personal pronoun ἐμέ (“me”), supplied for the verb ἐπερωτάω (“ask”), but lacking for its Hebrew counterpart, שאל (“ask”), has been undermined by 1QIsa^a. Unlike the MT, 1QIsa^a provides the personal pronoun: “ללוֹא שאלוֹנִי, ‘by those who have not asked for me.’”¹³¹ The implication for Lim appears to be that a polylingual Jew like Paul could have equally relied on a Hebrew text in an instance such as this.

J. Ross Wagner, however, shows that this characterization is premature for two reasons. First, Paul’s reliance on the LXX tradition is suggested by *ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην*. “This is the only time in the entire LXX that this phrase is used to render a form of דרש [“seek, inquire”]. The later Greek versions α* and θ* stay closer to the sense of the Hebrew, translating ἐξεζητήθην [“I was sought”].”¹³² Second, the phrase καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα (“and contrary”), which occurs in both LXX Isa 65:2 and Paul’s citation of this verse in

¹³¹ Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 147.

¹³² Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 208. Material in brackets is mine.

Rom 10:21 “appears to be a uniquely septuagintal reading.”¹³³ Moreover, throughout his study Wagner takes up “Lim’s challenge to examine the full range of available witnesses to the text of Isaiah in order to see whether the hypothesis that Paul’s citations sometimes depend on a Hebrew text rather than on a form of the LXX is actually borne out by the evidence.”¹³⁴ In the end, Wagner’s “close examination of the wording of Paul’s quotations and allusions to Isaiah in Romans supports the consensus view that Paul cites a Greek text (or texts) of this prophetic book,” finding it at no point “necessary to suppose that Paul has relied on a Hebrew or Aramaic text of Isaiah.”¹³⁵ What Wagner found for Isaiah matches what the other post-Qumran studies of Dietrich-Alex Koch and Stanley found for Paul’s biblical engagement as a whole.¹³⁶ Thus this study will proceed on the assumption that Paul, as well as those with whom he was in dialogue, would have relied upon Greek texts of the Jewish scriptures.

Critical Editions of the Septuagint: Psalms as a Test Case

The critically reconstructed LXX texts employed in this study are, when available, those of the Göttingen series¹³⁷ and, when not available, those of the Rahlfs–

¹³³ Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 208. For more on the citation of LXX Isa 65:1–2 in Rom 10:20–21, see *ibid.*, 209–211.

¹³⁴ Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 8.

¹³⁵ Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 344, 345 respectively.

¹³⁶ Koch, *Schrift*, 48; Stanley, *Paul*, 340.

¹³⁷ These include John William Wevers, ed., *Genesis* (Septuaginta 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); *idem*, *Exodus* (Septuaginta 2.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991); *idem*, *Leviticus* (Septuaginta 2.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); *idem*, *Deuteronomium* (Septuaginta 3.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977); Robert Hanhart, ed., *Esdrae liber II* (Septuaginta 8.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Psalmi Cum Odis* (Septuaginta 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae* (Septuaginta 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976); *Sapientia*

Hanhart *Septuaginta*.¹³⁸ Although one can never be certain that our reconstructed texts match precisely those utilized by Paul and his contemporaries, two factors suggest that *in hermeneutically significant details* our reconstructed texts are reliable exemplars in this regard. The first is the state of *limited*, as opposed to all-encompassing, textual fluidity. Similarly, the second factor is that, with the possible exception of the Psalms, none of the other texts with which this study is concerned seem to have circulated in more than one edition (e.g. like Jeremiah).¹³⁹ Indeed, as Koch notes concerning the LXX Pentateuch, whose wilderness traditions and golden calf texts are examined in this study, “The translation of the ‘Nomos’ is the oldest and most important part of the ‘Septuagint’ and the textual tradition shows here a greater unity than in the prophetic and poetic books.”¹⁴⁰

Salomonis (Septuaginta 12.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980); idem, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta 12.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

¹³⁸ Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

¹³⁹ On the difference between textual criticism, which focuses on the transmission of the text once it has been fixed and is thus concerned with issues like textual fluidity, and literary criticism, which “studies the period of the literary formation of a book or set of books,” and is thus concerned with issues like different editions, see Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 79–83. See also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 283–326.

¹⁴⁰ “Die Übersetzung des >Nomos< ist der älteste und wichtigste Teil der >Septuaginta<, und die Textüberlieferung weist hier eine größere Geschlossenheit auf als in den prophetischen und poetischen Büchern,” Koch, *Schrift*, 51. The variations in Deut 32, mentioned earlier, and in the Tabernacle account of Exod 35–40 need not concern us since they lie outside the focus of this study. On the Tabernacle account, see D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1959); Detlef Fraenkel, “Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35–40,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta, Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John William Wevers; MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 140–86; Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 381–402.

Koch then adds, “This is clearly reflected in a comparison of the Pauline Pentateuch text with the individual majuscule and minuscule groups.”¹⁴¹

A consideration of the Psalms will further corroborate this claim that, *in hermeneutically significant details*, our critically reconstructed texts are reliable representatives of their ancient ancestors employed by Paul and his contemporaries. The Psalms are selected for extended treatment for three reasons. First, Ps 106(105) is central to this study. Second, as just noted, there are questions about the number of editions in which the Psalms may have circulated in Paul’s day. Third, the Göttingen critical text by Alfred Rahlfs, as we shall see, has been repeatedly criticized.

Our discussion begins with the possibility that the Psalms may have circulated in more than one edition. This is based on speculation surrounding the psalms manuscripts discovered in Qumran caves 11 and 4.¹⁴² At the center of this speculation is 11QPs^a. This Hebrew manuscript, copied around 50 CE, contains 49 compositions, comprising a mixture of psalms almost exclusively from the final third of the MT Psalter, though arranged in a different order and interspersed with other writings, including previously known and unknown works, all set within a Davidic framework.¹⁴³ In his 1965 DJD

¹⁴¹ “Dies spiegelt sich beim Vergleich des paulinischen Pentateuchtextes mit den einzelnen Majuskeln bzw. Minuskel-Gruppen deutlich wider,” Koch, *Schrift*, 51.

¹⁴² What follows is indebted to the summaries provided by Tov, “Excerpted,” 593–95; Brooke, “Psalms 105 and 106,” 267–74; idem, “Psalms in Early Jewish Literature,” 5–15.

¹⁴³ Utilizing the siglum → to indicate that the second listed composition follows directly from the first, Peter W. Flint (“The Book of Psalms in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *VT* 48 [1998]: 453–72[458]) identifies the contents of 11QPs^a as follows: “Psalm 101 → 102 → 103; 109; 118 → 104 → 147 → 105 → 146 → 148 [+ 120] → 121 → 122 → 123 → 124 → 125 → 126 → 127 → 128 → 129 → 130 → 131 → 132 → 119 → 135 → 136 (with Catena) → 145 (with postscript) → 154 → Plea for Deliverance → 139 → 137 → 138 → Sirach 51 → Apostrophe to Zion → Psalm 93 → 141 → 133 → 144 → 155 → 142 → 143 → 149 → 150 → Hymn to the Creator → David’s Last Words → David’s Compositions → Psalm 140 → 134 → 151A → 151B → blank column [*end*].”

edition of 11QPs^a and subsequent articles, James A. Sanders, while acknowledging that the Qumran finds reflect stability for the first two thirds of the MT Psalter, argued that the final third was in a state of flux in the first century and that 11QPs^a was regarded as a canonical text.¹⁴⁴ Bolstered by the discovery of additional psalter arrangements, some including “extra-canonical” psalms, in caves 11 and 4,¹⁴⁵ and Gerald H. Wilson’s “probable demonstration that the same organizing principles can be seen to lie behind the compilation of books four and five in the MT Psalter and behind the collections of 11QPs^a,”¹⁴⁶ Sanders’s proposal has proven quite influential, inspiring further speculation along these lines. Peter W. Flint, for example, has advocated three editions of the Psalter at Qumran: (1) Pss 1/2–89; (2) the 11QPs^a Psalter [Pss 1–89 plus the arrangement found in 11QPs^a, which also occurs in 11QPs^b and 4QPs^e]; and (3) the MT–150 Psalter [Pss 1–

Note, however, that Flint’s list is potentially misleading since it gives the impression that all of the psalms are found in their entirety, when, in reality, only select verses are found for some of them (e.g. vv. 25–29 for Ps 118; vv. 1–12, 25ff. for Ps 105; vv. 15–16, 8–9, 29? for Ps 118). See the quite different description provided by Menahem Haran (“11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms,” in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* [ed. Michael Fishbane and Marc Zvi Brettler; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993], 193–201[196]), who, unlike Flint, regards 11QPs^a as a liturgical collection secondary to the MT 150 Psalter.

¹⁴⁴ James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965); idem, “Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a),” *HTR* 59 (1966): 83–94; idem, “Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon,” *McCQ* 21 (1968): 284–98; idem, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a) Reviewed,” in *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida* (ed. Matthew Black and William A. Smalley; The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 79–99.

¹⁴⁵ On the cave 4 manuscripts, see Eugene C. Ulrich, et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD 16; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

¹⁴⁶ Brooke, “Psalms 105 and 106,” 269. See Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico: Scholars, 1985).

89 plus 90–150, attested in MasPs^b]; while George J. Brooke has stressed that “there is possible, even probable evidence, for more editions than three.”¹⁴⁷

From the beginning, however, Sanders’s proposal regarding 11QPs^a has also met with skepticism.¹⁴⁸ Patrick W. Skehan, for instance, noting the quotation of Ps 106:48 in 1 Chr 16:36, not properly a verse of Ps 106 but an editorial marker separating books four and five of the Psalter (cf. Pss 41:14[13]; 72:18–20; 89:53[52]), argued that the Chronicler was borrowing from a fixed Psalter as early as 400 BCE. In Skehan’s view, 11QPs^a is to be regarded as a liturgical arrangement that is dependent on, rather than in competition with, the MT 150 Psalter.¹⁴⁹ Moreover, Roger T. Beckwith has observed that the reference to David writing 3600 psalms in the prose interlude of 11QPs^a known as the “Compositions of David” reflects a knowledge of the MT 150 Psalter, since 150 multiplied by 24 (the number of Levitical courses) equals 3600.¹⁵⁰

Although Brooke concedes this point, he notes, in response, that the subsequent reference to a total of 4050 songs composed by David in the same interlude “gives plenty

¹⁴⁷ Brooke, “Psalms in Early Jewish Literature,” 6–7, 9. Cf. Peter W. Flint, “The ‘11QPs^a–Psalter’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Including the Preliminary Edition of 4QPs^c,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Biblical Interpretation Series 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 173–95; idem, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

¹⁴⁸ E.g., Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text,” *Text* 5 (1966): 22–33.

¹⁴⁹ Patrick W. Skehan, “A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a,” *CBQ* 35 (1973): 195–205; idem, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 163–82. More recently, see the essay by Haran cited in n. 143. Skehan’s argument that the quotation of Ps 106:48 in 1 Chron 16:36 points to a fixed Psalter is now disputed. See Adele Berlin, “Psalms in the Book of Chronicles,” in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, Its Exegesis, and Its Language* (ed. Mosheh Bar-Asher, et al.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 21–36[esp. 33, n. 28].

¹⁵⁰ Roger T. Beckwith, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian: Biblical, Intertestamental and Patristic Studies* (AGJU 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 141–66.

of scope for alternative collections of psalms.”¹⁵¹ Brooke further suggests that “the publication of all the psalms manuscripts from Qumran’s Cave 4 has resulted in the debate swinging in favour of those who reckon that the Hebrew psalter existed in at least two forms in late Second Temple Palestine.” Yet, according to Emanuel Tov, “the arguments adduced in the past in favor of the assumption that *11QPs^a* reflects a liturgical collection also hold with regard to the texts from cave 4.”¹⁵²

Fortunately, we need not await the outcome of this debate concerning the Hebrew edition(s) of the Psalter. Tyler F. Williams has argued convincingly for the traditional second century BCE date of the Greek translation of the Psalter.¹⁵³ Employed in this LXX translation is a word-based, or literal,¹⁵⁴ translation technique to render a proto-

¹⁵¹ Brooke, “Psalms in Early Jewish Literature,” 10. Subsequent quote from *ibid.*, 6.

¹⁵² Tov, “Excerpted,” 595. Regarding these liturgical arguments, Tov (*ibid.*, 595, n. 61) states: “*11QPs^a* contains prose as well as poetry sections showing the purpose of the collection (focus on David). To one of the psalms (145) the scroll has added liturgical antiphonal additions. The writing of the tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in this text may indicate that the scribe considered this to be a nonbiblical text. To these arguments Talmon recently added the fact that *11QPs^a*, unlike *MasPs^b* and other biblical manuscripts, does not present the texts in a stichometric arrangement which was apparently reserved to the biblical texts.” Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, “Fragments of a Psalms Scroll from Masada, *MPs^b* (Masada 1103–1742),” in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Marc Zvi Brettler; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 318–27[324].

¹⁵³ Tyler F. Williams, “Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter,” in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 248–76.

¹⁵⁴ On the characterization “word-based,” or literal, for the translation technique displayed in the LXX Psalter, see Albert Pietersma, “Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as a Case in Point),” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 33–45[38]. Although “word-based,” the LXX Psalter often clarifies what is assumed or implied in its proto-MT *Vorlage* through minor exegetical pluses, sometimes enhances perceived pentateuchal allusions in its source text, and even occasionally engages in intertextual exegesis. See the studies of Jan Joosten, “The Impact of the Septuagint Pentateuch on the Greek Psalms,” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 197–205; Randall X. Gauthier, “Examining the ‘Pluses’ in the Greek Psalter: A Study of

Masoretic version of the Psalter.¹⁵⁵ And, as even Brooke concedes, “the overwhelming view of the evidence suggests that the New Testament authors were heavily dependent upon the LXX version of the psalter.”¹⁵⁶ This is certainly true of Paul. In fact, Moisés Silva’s study of Paul’s citations of the Psalter, including those of the disputed epistles, leads him to conclude that

[T]he weight of the evidence speaks loudly in favor of textual stability and continuity. Out of 24 Pauline citations from the Greek Psalter, 22 clearly reflect the critically restored text. Only in the case of Rom. 11.9 = Ps. 68.23 and Eph. 4.8 = Ps. 67.19 is there any real chance that they derive from a competing translation—and even these are not quite convincing.¹⁵⁷

The final question to be answered, however, concerns the adequacy of the critically restored text for the LXX Psalms in particular. Sidney Jellicoe, for example,

the Septuagint Translation *Qua* Communication,” in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (ed. Johann Cook; VTSup 127; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 45–76.

¹⁵⁵ For a response to the suggestions of Eugene C. Ulrich (“The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Implications for an Edition of the Septuagint Psalter,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* [ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; MSU 24, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 323–36) and Ulrich Rösen-Weinhold (“Der Septuaginta-Psalter in seinen verschiedenen Textformen zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* [ed. Erich Zenger; Herders Biblische Studien 32; Freiburg: Herder, 2001], 61–87) that LXX Psalms is a secondary revision brought into conformity with a proto-MT Psalter, rather than the Old Greek, see Smith, “Linguistic,” 3–4.

¹⁵⁶ Brooke, “Psalms in Early Jewish Literature,” 7.

¹⁵⁷ Moisés Silva, “The Greek Psalter in Paul’s Letters: A Textual Study,” in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 277–88[288]. Silva (ibid, 279) lists Paul’s citations of the Psalms according to the canonical order of the latter as follows: Ps 5:9(10) in Rom 3:13a; Ps 8:6(7) in 1 Cor 15:27; Ps 10:7(9:28) in Rom 3:14; Ps 14(13):1–3 (=Ps 53:1–3[52:2–4]) in Rom 3:10–12; Ps 18:49(17:50) (= 2 Sam 22:50) in Rom 15:9; Ps 19:4(18:5) in Rom 10:18; Ps 24(23):1 in 1 Cor 10:26; Ps 32(31):1–2 in Rom 4:7–8; Ps 36:1(35:2) in Rom 3:18; Ps 44:22(43:23) in Rom 8:36; Ps 51:4(50:6) in Rom 3:4; Ps 62:12(61:13) (cf. Prov 24:12) in Rom 2:6; Ps 68:18(67:19) in Eph 4:8; Ps 69:9(68:10) in Rom 15:3; Ps 69:22–23(68:23–24) in Rom 11:9–10; Ps 94(93):11 in 1 Cor 3:20; Ps 94(93):14 in Rom 11:2; Ps 110(109):1 in 1 Cor 15:25; Ps 112(111):9 in 2 Cor 9:9; Ps 116:10(115:1) in 2 Cor 4:13; Ps 117(116):1 in Rom 15:11; Ps 140:3(139:4) in Rom 3:13b; Ps 143(142):2 in Rom 3:20 and Gal 2:16.

while praising Joseph Ziegler's Göttingen edition of Wisdom because "nothing of any relevance has been overlooked," says of Alfred Rahlfs's Göttingen text, "As a critical edition of the Psalter this volume ... falls far short of the desiderata."¹⁵⁸ Jellicoe is not alone in his opinion. Since its initial 1931 publication as the first *editio maior* in the Göttingen series, Rahlfs's text has been lauded as a monumental work of scholarship, yet its shortcomings have been recognized as well.¹⁵⁹ These shortcomings relate to scope and methodology.

Regarding scope, Rahlfs faced an enormous challenge because "for the Greek Psalter there are extant roughly ten times as many mss as for the next most-attested book of the Old Testament in Greek (Genesis)."¹⁶⁰ Rather than attempting to assess all of this manuscript evidence and face an indefinite delay, Rahlfs judged it better to proceed with the publication of his less than fully critical edition.¹⁶¹ Complicating matters is that since

¹⁵⁸ Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 305, 297 respectively.

¹⁵⁹ See the early review of P. L. Hedley, "The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint," *HTR* 26 (1933): 57–72. For further literature related to Rahlfs's Göttingen edition, see Albert Pietersma, "Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter," in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm. Wevers; MSU 20, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/190; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 262–86; idem, "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast; MSU 24, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 12–32; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, Peter C. Austin, and Andrey Feuerverger, "The Assessment of Manuscript Affiliation within a Probabilistic Framework: A Study of Alfred Rahlfs's Core Manuscript Groupings for the Greek Psalter," in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 98–124; Ariane Cordes, "Der Septuaginta-Psalter?: Zur Geschichte des Griechischen Psalmentextes und seiner Edition," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (ed. Erich Zenger; Herders Biblische Studien 32; Freiburg: Herder, 2001), 49–60.

¹⁶⁰ Pietersma, "Present State," 13.

¹⁶¹ Rahlfs, *Psalmi Cum Odis*, 5.

Rahlfs's day many more papyri and parchments have been discovered. While most of these contain relatively little text, two, Papyrus Chester Beatty XIII (Rahlfs no. 2149) and Papyrus Bodmer XXIV (Rahlfs no. 2110), are substantial. The latter, in fact, is so important that "It alone," according to Albert Pietersma, "would demand a re-doing of Rahlfs' *Psalmi cum Odis*."¹⁶²

In terms of methodology, Hedley's 1933 review, for example, criticized Rahlfs for being too conservative in his failure to: excise secondary accretions; adopt poorly attested readings, which may nonetheless be original; and propose emendations. He also criticized Rahlfs for utilizing criteria weighted against the so-called Lucianic or Byzantine text.¹⁶³ While endorsing both criticisms in the main, Pietersma observes regarding the latter, "Yet time and again Rahlfs demonstrates that a good text-critic will not let himself be hampered by his own rules, and, consequently, he not infrequently reaches conclusions contrary to his guidelines."¹⁶⁴ Even so, these shortcomings related to scope and methodology suggest caution against the naïve assumption that Rahlfs's text represents the Old Greek in every respect, since a full consideration of that textual attestation to the Greek Psalter, along with an improved approach, would no doubt lead to numerous refinements.

Such caution, however, does not exclude measured confidence. If the recent work of Jannes Smith is any indication, these refinements, at least for the purposes of this

¹⁶² Pietersma, "Present State," 29. For a bibliography related to Papyrus Bodmer XXIV, see Gauthier, "Examining the 'Pluses'," 50, n. 16.

¹⁶³ Hedley, "Göttingen," 61–72.

¹⁶⁴ Pietersma, "Ra 2110," 262. For other criticisms of Rahlfs's methodology, see idem, "Present State," 14–16.

study, would appear to be relatively minor and often hermeneutically insignificant. In his 2005 University of Toronto dissertation, “A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the Hallelouia Psalms of the Septuagint,” directed by Pietersma, Smith explores the meaning of Pss 105(104)–106(105) and Pss 111(110)–113(112) as intended by the LXX translator. After evaluating and incorporating suggested corrections of Rahlfs’s readings, including those based on Papyrus Bodmer XXIV, as well as subjecting Rahlfs’s textual decisions to critical scrutiny and consulting published Greek manuscripts to verify the accuracy of Rahlfs’s apparatus, Smith proposes only six changes for Ps 106(105), all of which lack interpretive significance.¹⁶⁵ Smith’s proposed changes will be adopted in this study and we shall proceed under the cautious yet confident assumption that, *in hermeneutically significant details*, our critically reconstructed texts are reliable representatives of their ancient ancestors employed by Paul and his contemporaries.

Conclusion

The first part of this chapter considered the hermeneutical approach to my architectural analysis. Although indebted to C. H. Dodd for the substructure metaphor, I noted my primary reliance upon Richard B. Hays’s notion of metaleptic allusion and

¹⁶⁵ Smith, “Linguistic,” 6–7, 142, 147, 161, 208. The changes for Ps 106(105) include: the deletion of τῇ from the phrase ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ (v. 7); the alteration of ἀβύσσῳ to ἀβύσσοις (v. 9); the insertion of both instances of τὸν before proper names and deletion of the second καὶ from καὶ παρώργισαν τὸν Μωσῆν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ καὶ τὸν Ἀαρὼν τὸν ἅγιον κυρίου (v. 16); and the alteration of αἰχμαλωτισάντων to αἰχμαλωτεύσαντων (v. 46).

Similarly, Smith (ibid., 46, 93, 102, 104, 110, 112, 118–119) proposes only eight changes for Ps 105(104). The only one that has interpretive significance is the insertion of οὐ (“no, not”) in the phrase καὶ οὐ παρεπείκραναν τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ (“and they [Moses and Aaron] did not rebel against his words”) in v. 28. Besides this insertion of οὐ, the other changes for Ps 105(104) include: the deletion of τοῖς from the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (v. 1); the deletion of πᾶν from καὶ συνέτριψεν πᾶν ξύλον ὀρίου αὐτῶν (v. 33); the deletion of τὸν from καὶ κατέφαγεν πάντα τὸν χόρτον ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν (v. 35); the deletion of ὁ from ἐπέπεσεν ὁ φόβος αὐτῶν ἐπ’ αὐτούς (v. 38); the deletion of both instances of αὐτοῖς from διεπέτασεν νεφέλην εἰς σκέπην αὐτοῖς καὶ πῦρ τοῦ φωτίσαι αὐτοῖς τὴν νύκτα (v. 39); and the alteration of the word order from τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ to ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ (v. 43).

Francis Watson's concept of a complex conversation between Paul, the text of scripture, and his contemporary interpreters. Also included in this discussion was an attempt to define and distinguish intertextual terminology (echo, allusion, quotation) more clearly than does Hays as well as a lengthy critical response to the objections by Christopher D. Stanley concerning the importance of the original audience and other ancient realities. This critical response, however, was not devoid of appreciative appropriation. Stanley fostered a reconceptualization of metalepsis in light of an ancient oral/aural environment and led us to reflect on the possibility that excerpts of Pss 105(104)–107(106) may have been utilized for liturgical and/or pedagogical purposes within Jewish and Christian circles in first century Rome. In these two respects, Stanley is to be credited for indirectly strengthening the methodology employed in this study.

The second part of this chapter considered the literary and linguistic atmosphere of Rom 1:18–2:11. It was argued that the interaction of Paul and his contemporaries with Greek texts of the Jewish scriptures must be set within the broader context of limited textual fluidity, a context that has become especially evident in the post-Qumran era. Precisely because this fluidity is *limited*, however, we can be confident of a reliable match *in hermeneutically significant details* between our critically reconstructed texts and their ancient ancestors which would have been employed by Paul and others. The extended treatment of the LXX Psalms provided corroboration for this claim. With our consideration of these preliminary, though important, matters complete, we turn now to discuss Ps 106(105).

CHAPTER 4

PSALM 106(105)

Introduction

The primary claim of this dissertation is that the proper alignment of the four interlocking pavement stones that I have identified (a problematic particle, an uncertain similarity, an unidentified interlocutor, and a possible dialogue partner) leads to the recognition that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11, argumentation in which evocations of the calf play a prominent role. Paul's ironic application of Ps 106(105):20, 41a to what appears to be *only* Gentile idolatry and immorality in Rom 1:18–32 (esp. vv. 22–32) paves the way for his inferential application of these same verses to a Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:1–4, before concluding with an indirect application of Ps 106(105):19–23, by means of Deut 9–10, in Rom 2:5–11. Secondly, I suggest that Paul's decision to construct his argument in Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, a particular conversation about the construction of Jewish identity, one involving Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106).

Given the significance of Ps 106(105) to my primary and secondary proposals, it is important to engage in a careful examination of this psalm. Understanding Ps 106(105), in and of itself, will prevent us from forcing the psalm into the mold of Paul's thought, while, at the same time, allowing us to see how the psalm supports his

argumentation. Moreover, we will also be in a position to see how Ps 106(105) may have served as the basis for a Restoration-oriented construction of Jewish identity, a matter to be treated in chapter six.

Accordingly, this chapter is devoted to a close reading of Ps 106(105), one that includes a lengthy examination of Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10 as well. It is composed of three subsequent sections. Section two, the longest, concentrates on Ps 106(105), with particular attention to the manner in which the golden calf incident in vv. 19–23 plays a central role in terms of its position, terminology, intertextual reference, and participation in thematic progression. As a prelude to discussing their conflation in vv. 19–20, 23a,d, Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10 also receive extended treatment. This extended treatment, in turn, prepares for the analysis of Paul’s argumentation in chapter five, especially his evocations in Rom 2:5–11, and the larger context of Paul’s argumentation sketched in chapter six, one in which the differences between Moses’ separate but interrelated intercessions in Exod 32–34 and his single, though tripartite, intercessory act in Deut 9–10 will prove important. Section three briefly comments on Paul’s appropriation of Ps 106(105), including the degree to which one should assume that Paul was aware of the exegetical subtleties unearthed in our close reading and the hermeneutical significance of the verses upon which Paul constructs his argument in Rom 1:18–2:11. Section four then serves as a short conclusion to the chapter.

Psalm 106(105): Israelite Infidelity Outside and Inside the Land

Appearing at the end of Book IV, Ps 106(105) occupies a prominent position in the canonical psalter. I shall have more to say about its relationship to Ps 105(104) as

well as Ps 107(106) in chapter six. Ps 106(105) seems to have originated from a post-exilic setting. This setting is suggested by the prayer for restoration in v. 47 and by the manner in which vv. 4–5 and v. 27 allude to the Exile.¹ In terms of form, Ps 106(105) begins as a hymn before giving way to communal lament, only to express hope of renewed praise at the end.² The setting is certainly cultic, although attempts to define that setting more concretely have not gained widespread support.³ A geographical orientation to the Land proves important for discerning the structure and development of Ps 106(105). The central section, vv. 7–46, divides into two subsections: vv. 7–33 and vv. 34–46. Israel's presence outside of and then inside of the Land determines the difference between these two subsections. Geographical markers for vv. 7–33, whether explicit or implicit, distinguish seven sinful episodes outside of the Land (cf. vv. 7, 14, 16, 19, 25, 28, 32),⁴ whereas the events of vv. 34–46, the imitation of, abandonment to, and rescue

¹ In spite of these indications, not all scholars agree that MT Ps 106 as a whole has a post-exilic provenance. Neil H. Richardson ("Psalm 106: Yahweh's Succoring Love Saves from the Death of a Broken Covenant," in *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope* [ed. John H. Marks and Robert M. Good; Guilford: Four Quarters, 1987], 191–203[203]), for example, argues that the "prosodic and thought affinities" of vv. 6–46 point "to a Deuteronomistic school in Judah sometime just prior to the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.," whereas the style of vv. 1–5, 47 suggests a later, post-exilic hand. For a balanced discussion of the issues which endorses a post-exilic provenance, see Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* (2d ed.; WBC 21; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 67–68.

² Scholars disagree about which formal element, praise or penitence, ultimately predominates. Allen (*Psalms 101–150*, 66), for instance, concludes that "form-critically the psalm can be defined as a communal lament strongly marked by hymnic features," whereas Walter Beyerlin ("Der nervus rerum in Psalm 106," *ZAW* 86 [1974]: 50–64[64]) argues that the psalm should instead "be understood precisely on the basis of its introductory call to praise."

³ For various proposed settings, see Friedrich Baumgärtel, "Zur Liturgie in der 'Sektenrolle' vom Toten Meer," *ZAW* 65 (1953): 263–65; Robert P. Carroll, "Rebellion and Dissent in Ancient Israelite Society," *ZAW* 89 (1977): 176–204[184, n. 37]; F. C. Fensham, "Neh. 9 and Pss. 105, 106, 135 and 136. Post-Exilic Historical Traditions in Poetic Form," *JNSL* 9 (1981): 35–51[43–50].

⁴ Scholars who draw attention to the structural significance of the seven episodes of sin outside of the Land include Konrad Schaefer (*Psalms* [Berit Olam; Collegeville: Liturgical, 2001], 263) and Angelo Passaro ("Theological Hermeneutics and Historical Motifs in Pss 105–106," in *History and Identity: How*

from the Gentiles, are located inside of the Land (cf. v. 38). Accordingly, the structure of Ps 106(105) may be understood as follows:

- I. Introduction: Praise and Penitence (vv. 1–6)
- II. Rebellion Outside the Land: Seven Sins (vv. 7–33)
 - A. Embitterment at Red Sea and the LORD’s Salvation (vv. 7–12)
 - B. Impatient Craving in the Desert (vv. 13–15)
 - C. Angering Moses and Aaron in the Camp (vv. 16–18)
 - D. Calf Worship at Horeb and Moses’ Intercession (vv. 19–23)
 - E. Heedless Grumbling in the Tents of Kadesh Barnea (vv. 24–27)
 - F. Initiation into Baal of Peor and Phinehas’ Propitiation (vv. 28–31)
 - G. Inciting Moses at the Water of Strife (vv. 32–33)
- III. Rebellion Inside the Land: Cyclical Sin (vv. 34–46)
 - A. Imitation of Gentiles Leads to Defilement (vv. 34–40)
 - B. Abandonment to Gentiles Leads to Affliction (vv. 41–42)
 - C. Pattern of Salvation and Sin (vv. 43–46)
- IV. Conclusion: Plea for Restoration (v. 47)
- V. Doxological Formula to Close Book IV of the Psalter (v. 48)

Praise, Penitence, and Concluding Plea (vv. 1–6, 47)

The introduction (vv. 1–6) divides into three parts. Verses 1–3 call for praise of the sovereign LORD and pronounce a blessing upon those who keep κρίσιν (“judgment”), or act righteously in every season.⁵ Verses 4–5, however, suggest that those who recite

Israel’s Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History [ed. Núria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2006; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006], 43–54[51–52]. Richard J. Clifford (*Psalms 73–150* [Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon, 2003], 156–57) combines vv. 24–27 and vv. 28–31 into one episode with two sins so that vv. 34–46 form the seventh sin. Cf. Anthony R. Ceresko, “Endings and Beginnings: Alphabetic Thinking and the Shaping of Psalms 106 and 150,” *CBQ* 68 (2006): 32–46[38]. Based upon a detailed analysis of the Hebrew text, Pierre Auffret (“‘Afin que nous rendions grâce à ton nom’: Étude structurelle du Psaume 106,” *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 11 [1994]: 75–96) makes a strong case for an elaborate chiasmic structure for the psalm as a whole, one that would place vv. 24–27 at the center. The primary weakness with his proposal is the placement of vv. 13–15 in concentric parallel with vv. 34–42.

⁵ The terms δυναστεία and αἵνεσις in v. 2 recur in vv. 7–12 (cf. vv. 8, 12).

this psalm have neither kept judgment nor acted righteously. Instead, they find themselves in a position in which they must request: μνήσθητι ἡμῶν, κύριε, ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου, ἐπίσκεψαι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σου (“Remember us, LORD, in the good pleasure [you have] toward your people, visit us with your salvation”; v. 4). The purpose of this remembrance and salvific visitation, according to v. 5, is so that the recipients would look with the kindness τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου (“of your elect ones”), rejoice with the joy τοῦ ἔθνους σου (“of your nation”), and engage in praise μετὰ τῆς κληρονομίας σου (“with your inheritance”). The final designation of v. 5 turns out to be a word-play. As the parallels with ἐκλεκτός (“elect”) and ἔθνος (“nation”) indicate, κληρονομία (“inheritance”), in the first instance, refers to the people of Israel. Yet, secondarily, the term also evokes the Land-inheritance from which those who are requesting remembrance and salvific visitation have presumably been separated.

This presumption of separation receives confirmation in the concluding plea for restoration. Formally, v. 47 recalls vv. 4–5, sharing in common a twofold use of aorist second-person singular imperatives (μνήσθητι [“remember”], ἐπίσκεψαι [“visit”]; σῶσον [“save”], ἐπισυνάγαγε [“gather”]) followed by first-person plural objects (ἡμῶν, ἡμᾶς [“us”]), with a vocative address, κύριε (“O LORD”), and a preponderance of the second-person singular masculine possessive pronoun, σου (“your”), all of which is aimed in the service of renewed praise.⁶ The relationship between these texts extends beyond formal features to terminology, especially when vv. 1–3 are taken into consideration.⁷ These

⁶ Allen’s (*Psalms 101–150*, 68) observation regarding the Hebrew text also holds true for the Greek: τοῦ λαοῦ σου of v. 4 “is nicely matched by” ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν of v. 47.

formal and terminological similarities contribute to the semantic development that takes place at the end of the psalm. What is implicit in vv. 4–5 becomes explicit in v. 47: God’s salvific visitation entails “gathering” (ἐπισυνάγω) his people from among the nations.

Returning to the third and final part of the introduction, v. 6, these exiles paradoxically find hope in confessing: ἡμάρτομεν μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἠνομήσαμεν, ἠδικήσαμεν (“We have sinned with our fathers, we have acted lawlessly, we acted unrighteously”). The litany of sins that follow, however, does not include those of the monarchical era that led to Exile, but only those of the Exodus and wilderness generations as well as, skipping over the conquest era, those of the Judges period. The implication of omitting the monarchical era, in particular, may be to suggest that the infidelity that led to Exile is not unprecedented.⁸ If so, then neither is the covenantal mercy for which the exiles hope. Indeed, the LORD’s mercy is evident even in such a sordid history of rebellion.

Rebellion Outside the Land: Seven Sins (vv. 7–33)

Verse 7, which begins the litany of sins, is linked to that which precedes through the expression οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν (“our fathers”; cf. v. 6) and the twofold reference to σου (“your”; cf. vv. 4–5). Additionally, v. 7 participates in a double-*inclusio*:

⁷ Besides κύριος, this overlap includes: αἰνεσις, vv. 2, 47d; ἐξομολογέω, vv. 1, 47c; ἔθνος, vv. 5, 47b; σωτήριος/σώζω, vv. 4, 47a.

⁸ The omission of sins during the monarchical era may also be explicable on political grounds, especially if Ps 106 was written early in the exilic period when officials who had been part of the monarchy were still alive.

Table 10. Double-*Inclusio* of Ps 106(105)

⁷ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ οὐ συνῆκαν τὰ θαυμάσιά σου, οὐκ ἐμνήσθησαν τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ ἐλέους σου καὶ <u>παρεπίκραναν</u>	⁷ Our fathers in Egypt did not understand your wonders, <i>they did not remember the multitude of your mercy</i> and <i>they became embittered</i>
³³ ... ὅτι παεπίκραναν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ διέστειλεν ἐν τοῖς χεῖλεσιν αὐτοῦ.	³³ ... because <u>they</u> [the Israelites] <u>embittered</u> his [Moses'] spirit, and he [Moses] divided his lips.
⁴³ πλεονάκις ἐρρύσατο αὐτούς, αὐτοὺς δὲ <u>παρεπίκραναν</u> αὐτὸν ... ⁴⁵ καὶ ἐμνήσθη τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ καὶ μετεμελήθη κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ	⁴³ Many times he delivered them, but <i>they became embittered</i> at him ... ⁴⁵ and <i>he</i> [the LORD] <i>remembered</i> his covenant and relented according to <i>the multitude of his mercy</i>

The outer *inclusio*, indicated by bold, italicized script, frames the central section of the psalm (vv. 7–46) as the contrast between Israel’s failure to remember the multitude of the LORD’s mercy, borne by a misunderstanding of his wonders in Egypt, which led to “embitterment” (παραπικραίνω) *versus* the LORD’s covenantal memory, which caused him, time and again, to relent according to the multitude of his mercy, in spite of Israel’s “embittered” behavior.⁹ Viewed in light of the request for remembrance in v. 4, this

⁹ The term παραπικραίνω and its cognate παραπικρασμός do not occur prior to the LXX and their subsequent use is always influenced by the LXX. The πικρ- root conveys the idea of bitterness, even if the consistency with which παραπικραίνω in the LXX Psalter renders the synonyms מרה (5:11; 78[77]:8, 17, 40, 56; 105[104]:28; 106[105]:7, 33, 43; 107[106]:11) and מרר (66[65]:7; 68[67]:7) suggests that the verb may also have taken on the nuance of rebellion, as opposed to reflecting a confusion on the translator’s part between מרה and מרר (“be/make bitter”). Cf. the discussions in Wilhelm Michaelis, “πικρός, πικρία, πικραίνω, παραπικραίνω, παραπικρασμός,” *TDNT* 6:122–27[125–27]; Jannes Smith, “A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the Hallelouia Psalms of the Septuagint” (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005), 95–96.

The key question for rendering παραπικραίνω in Ps 106(105) is whether to construe the verb intransitively (“become embittered”) or transitively (“to embitter”). The transitive sense in Ps 106(105):33 (embittering Moses’ spirit) seems clear. It seems equally clear that Ps 106(105):7, which lacks an object, employs παραπικραίνω intransitively, even though *NETS* offers the ambiguous “and embittered” and the German translation edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer (*Septuaginta deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009], 860) attempts to supply the object to yield a transitive sense: “und embitterten (dich).” Ps 106(105):43, however, presents a challenge as παραπικραίνω here could be rendered intransitively in light of v. 7, or transitively, in light of

frame expresses hope in the continued validity of the LORD's covenantal mercy, providing impetus for the psalm's recitation.

The inner *inclusio*, indicated by underlining, highlights the initial repetition of the term παραπικραίνω. In between these two occurrences, geographical markers, as noted, distinguish seven sinful episodes outside of the Land (vv. 7–12, 13–15, 16–18, 19–23, 24–27, 28–31, 32–33). Three of these sinful episodes include a salvific intervention (vv. 7–12, 19–23, 28–31). Occupying the central position, in both cases, is the golden calf rebellion, as recounted in vv. 19–23, a centrality that also proves to be terminological, intertextual, and thematic. Such centrality, as I shall later suggest, may have played a role in Paul's decision to utilize language drawn from v. 20 to portray a foundational idolatrous “change” in Rom 1:23. In what follows immediately, I shall first provide an overview of sins one to three and five to seven, before returning to the central sin of the calf for analysis.

Overview of Sins One to Three and Five to Seven (vv. 7–18, 24–33)

Embitterment at Red Sea and LORD's Salvation (vv. 7–12)

The first sin of “embitterment” in vv. 7–12 occurred ἀναβαίνοντες ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ (“when going up to the Red Sea”),¹⁰ thus before Israel's wilderness

v. 33. Although I regard the intransitive sense as preferable because of the lexical parallels between v. 7 and v. 43, the transitive sense cannot be entirely excluded.

¹⁰ Corresponding to ἀναβαίνοντες in LXX Ps 105:7, MT Ps 106:7 has עָלָה לְיָ. The MT phrase is often emended to יָלַח לְיָ because of the awkwardness that is created by the immediately following reference to הַיָּם הַהוּא (e.g. Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 62, 65). The LXX translator apparently read the same consonants as the MT, construing them as a single word, a participle form of עָלָה, thus creating what Smith (“Linguistic,” 144) has referred to as a “topographical impossibility.” LXX Exod 13:18 employs the verb ἀναβαίνω in close proximity to τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν, but not in the same manner as LXX Ps 105:7.

experiences.¹¹ Even if loosely, the psalm passage recalls Exod 14:10–12,¹² a text in which the Israelites, confronted with the impending threat of the Egyptian army, say to Moses in v. 12:¹³

Table 11. Exod 14:12

<p>¹² οὐ τοῦτο ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐλάλήσαμεν πρὸς σὲ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ λέγοντες Πάρες ἡμᾶς, ὅπως δουλεύσωμεν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις; κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἡμᾶς δουλεύειν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἢ ἀποθανεῖν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ.</p>	<p>¹² Was this not the matter about which we spoke to you in Egypt when we said, “Leave us alone so that we may be enslaved to the Egyptians?” For it would be better to be enslaved to the Egyptians than to die in this desert.</p>
---	--

Lurking, then, in the background of the appeal to Exod 14:10–12 is the Israelites’ rejection of the Promised Land due to a fear of death, in this case expressed in the claim that it would have been better to remain slaves in Egypt. As we shall see, rejection of the Promised Land will remain in the background of the next two episodes in Ps

¹¹ With regard to the MT, Allen (*Psalms 101–150*, 71) notes several affinities with Ezek 20:6–10 and even suggests literary dependence. The parallels, however, are less clear in the LXX.

¹² Scholars who note the connection with Exod 14:10–12 include: Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; CC; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 318; J. Clinton McCann Jr., “The Book of Psalms: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 4 (ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 1110; Schaefer, *Psalms*, 263; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 71.

¹³ Throughout my treatment of Ps 106(105), I assume (with e.g. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 317) reliance upon a completed Pentateuch. Even if scholars (e.g. Jan-Albert Roetman and Caspar Visser ’t Hooft, “Le Psaume 106 et le Pentateuque,” *ETR* 85 [2010]: 233–43) sometimes question this assumption with regard to MT Ps 106, there is no doubt that LXX Ps 105 would have been interpreted in light of the LXX Pentateuch. Indeed, this intertextual relationship began with the translation of the LXX Psalms. See Martin Flashar, “Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter,” *ZAW* 32 (1912): 81–116, 161–89, 241–68[183–89]; Emanuel Tov, “The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes à l’occasion de son 60e anniversaire* (ed. Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker; OBO 38; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 577–92; repr. in Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 183–94; Jan Joosten, “The Impact of the Septuagint Pentateuch on the Greek Psalms,” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 197–205.

106(105):13–18, only to come into the foreground following the account of the golden calf incident in vv. 19–23.

Besides alluding to Exod 14:10–12, vv. 7–12 have been shaped according to their placement in the psalm. Israel’s initial embitterment at the Red Sea does not yet require a mediator, as do the two other episodes with a salvific intervention (vv. 19–23, 28–31).

Rather, the LORD simply saves Israel ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦ γνωρίσαι τὴν δυναστείαν αὐτοῦ (“for the sake of his name, to make known his sovereignty,” v. 8; cf. Exod 6:6). That sovereignty is on full display as the LORD rebukes the Red Sea so that he can lead Israel in the depths, ὡς ἐν ἐρήμῳ (“as in the desert,” v. 9). The reference to the ἔρημος (“desert”) underscores the sovereignty of a God who causes dry land to appear where there had been sea; yet the term may also have ominous connotations, as ἔρημος signifies the place in which Israel became known for her rebellion, from the day she left Egypt (cf. e.g. Deut 9:7). Significantly, the ἔρημος is the setting for the next sin (cf. v. 14).

Before proceeding to that next sin, vv. 10–11 focus on the enemies from whom Israel is saved. These Egyptian oppressors are “covered” (καλύπτω) with water so that none escape. Israel’s enemies will reappear in vv. 40–42, where, rather than being saved from them, she will be abandoned to them. For now, however, v. 12 concludes with the Israelites’ positive response to their experience of salvation: καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ᾄσαν τὴν αἴνεσιν αὐτοῦ (“and they believed in his words and sang his praise”). Aside from references to her leaders (vv. 16, 23, 30–21) and a brief mention of

prayer (v. 44), this is the only positive response attributed to Israel in the central section of the psalm. Moreover, it is mitigated, if not undermined, by v. 24.

Impatient Craving in the Desert (vv. 13–15)

The second sin, impatient craving in the desert (vv. 13–15), conflates the stories about manna and quail in Exod 16:1–36 and Num 11:4–35. To understand the significance of this conflation, we need to review briefly each story. The quail account in Numbers is the more severe of the two. As a result of the influence of the ἐπίμικτος (“mixed-in”) among Israel, or foreign elements (cf. Exod 12:38; 2 Esd 23:3 [Neh 13:3]), the people ἐπεθύμησαν ἐπιθυμίαν (“desired with desire”),¹⁴ recalling the plentiful meat and other foods available in Egypt as opposed to paltry manna (Num 11:4–6). In response to this bout of strong desire, combined with dissatisfaction, the LORD ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ ... σφόδρα (“became exceedingly enraged with wrath”; v. 10) and, because of the Israelites’ “disobedience” (ἀπειθείω), pledged to supply meat for a month until it spewed out of their nostrils and induced nausea (v. 20).¹⁵ Still worse, once the meat arrived, the LORD’s anger erupted again, an outburst that effectively ends the story. Num 11:33–34 states:

¹⁴ ἐπεθύμησαν ἐπιθυμίαν translates יִתְאוּר תְּאוֹר in Num 11:4 (and the virtually identical יִתְאוּר תְּאוֹר in Ps 106[105]:14). This syntactical form, present in both Greek and Hebrew, is variously referred to as a cognate accusative, simple accusative of content, or accusative of the internal object. See respectively: BDF 84–85[§153]; Joüon 450–51[§125q].

¹⁵ For the sake of simplicity, I am omitting from my synopsis of Num 11:4–35 Moses’ despairing reaction to the Israelites’ behavior and the corresponding response of the LORD in the form of placing his Spirit upon seventy elders.

Table 12. Num 11:33–34

<p>³³ τὰ κρέα ἔτι ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν αὐτῶν πρὶν ἢ ἐκλείπειν, καὶ κύριος ἐθυμώθη εἰς τὸν λαόν, καὶ ἐπάταξεν κύριος ἐν τῷ λαῷ πληγὴν μεγάλην σφόδρα. ³⁴ καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Μνήματα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἔθαψαν τὸν λαὸν τὸν ἐπιθυμητὴν.</p>	<p>³³ The meat was still in their teeth, prior to its expiration,¹⁶ and the LORD became enraged at the people, and the LORD struck the people with a very great plague. ³⁴ And the name of that place was called “Tombs of Desire,” because there they buried the people who desired.</p>
---	--

At first, the etiological account of manna, with a brief mention of quail, in Exod 16:1–36 begins similarly. On the fifteenth day of the second month after the Exodus, the Israelites came to the desert of Sin and διεγόγγυζεν πᾶσα συναγωγὴ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ Μωσοῦν καὶ Ἀαρών (“the entire assembly of the sons of Israel grumbled against Moses and Aaron”), expressing the wish to have been struck down by the LORD in Egypt, where they had sat by pots of meat and been able to eat ἄρτους εἰς πλησμονήν (“bread to the full”), rather than die in the desert of hunger (Exod 16:1–3). Although the Israelites’ “grumbling” is subsequently stressed (cf. vv. 7, 8, 9), the LORD *does not* become enraged. Instead, he proposes to provide for and at the same time “test” (πειράζω) Israel, raining down ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (“bread from heaven”) for six days a week, with a double-portion on the sixth day, to see if the people will keep his Law or not by refraining from collection-attempts (i.e., work) on the seventh day (vv. 4–5; cf. vv. 21–26). Even when some of the people fail the “test” by searching for manna on the Sabbath, the LORD does not respond with extreme anger, still less a plague. Instead, he merely questions Moses about how long the Israelites would refuse to heed his Law (v. 28). Thus, despite a

¹⁶ John William Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* [SBLSCS 46; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998], 180–81) points out that whereas the Hebrew collocation כרת טרם “probably means ‘before it was chewed’ in reference to the meat, its Greek translation, πρὶν ἢ ἐκλείπειν, likely means “‘before life had left it,’ i.e. it was raw flesh that was being eaten.”

similar start, the account of manna in Exod 16:1–36 lacks the punitive element that is so pervasive in the quail story of Num 11:4–35.

This difference between the punitive aspects of Exod 16:1–36 and Num 11:4–35 proves significant for interpreting Ps 106(105):13–15. On the one hand, ἐπεθύμησαν ἐπιθυμῖαν (“they desired with desire”) in v. 14a recalls the programmatic use of this expression in Numbers; and, in turn, the “Tombs of Desire” to which the Israelites who “desired” were ultimately consigned in their death, as result of the LORD’s punitive plague (Num 11:4, 33–34). On the other hand, at least two details in Ps 106(105):13–15 point to Exod 16:1–36,¹⁷ an account that, even if it emphasizes the Israelites’ “grumbling,”¹⁸ lacks the punitive dimension of Num 11:4–35. First, the depiction of the Israelites as “quickly forgetting” (ἐτάχυναν ἐπελάθοντο) the LORD’s works in v. 13a, besides once again highlighting the Israelites’ lack of memory (cf. v. 7), fits with the manna account that, like the psalm passage, takes place shortly after the Red Sea miracle (cf. Exod 16:1). Second, the statement that the LORD sent πλησμονή (“fullness”) in v. 15b utilizes a term that occurs in Exod 16:3, 8, but not in Numbers.¹⁹

¹⁷ Connections less significant than the two about to be recounted include: the terms ἔρημος (Ps 106[105]:14a; Exod 16:1, 3, 10, 14, 32); περιάζω (Ps 106[105]:14b; Exod 16:4); and the cognates βουλή (Ps 106[105]:13b), βούλομαι (Exod 16:28).

¹⁸ διαγόγγυζω, γογγυσμός in Exod 16:2, 7, 8, 9, 12. The γογγύζω word-group (διαγογγύζω, γογγυσμός, γογγυστής) in the LXX frequently depicts Israel’s “grumbling” or “murmuring” against God in the wilderness and in the NT is often applied to Jewish opponents of Jesus. Besides the verses already listed, cf. Exod 15:24; 17:3; Num 11:1; 14:2, 27, 29, 36; 16:11, 41; 17:5, 10; Deut 1:27; Josh 9:18; Judg 1:14; Pss 59(58):16; 106(105):25; Isa 29:24; 30:12; 58:9; Lam 3:39; Jdt 5:22; 1 Macc 11:39; Wis 1:10–11; Sir 10:25; 31:24; 46:7; Pss. Sol. 5:13; 16:11; Matt 20:11; Luke 5:30; 15:2; 19:7; John 6:41, 43, 61; 7:12, 32; Acts 6:1; 1 Cor 10:10; Phil 2:14; 1 Pet 4:9; Jude 1:16. See also the article on this word-group by Karl Heinrich Rengstorf in *TDNT* 1:728–37.

¹⁹ A comparison between LXX Ps 105:15 and MT Ps 106:15 shows that πλησμονή does not render, שָׁבַע, as it does in Ps 78(77):25 and in Exod 16:3, 8 (cf. also e.g. Gen 41:30; Lev 25:19; 26:5; Deut 33:23), but rather חֲלָה, which the NRSV interprets as “a wasting disease.” Although there is debate about

This conflation of characteristics from Exod 16:1–36 and Num 11:4–35 in Ps 106(105):13–15 creates ambiguity. If one stresses the connection with Num 11:4–35 in v. 14a, then *πλησμονή* takes on a punitive dimension, connoting the kind of “fullness” that spews out of one’s nostrils. If, however, one emphasizes the framing elements of Exod 16:1–36 in vv. 13a and 15b, one of which is the term *πλησμονή* itself, then the passage as a whole recalls the LORD’s gracious provision in response to illicit desire. Given the placement of vv. 13–15 in the psalm, immediately after Israel’s positive expression of faith and praise (v. 12) and before punishment becomes clear (vv. 17–18), the latter seems more likely. I shall note the thematic significance of this insight when discussing the central sin of the golden calf.

Angering Moses and Aaron in the Camp (vv. 16–18)

The third sin in vv. 16–18 is an allusion to the uprising recounted in Num 16:1–17:13, one that focuses on the punishment of Israel’s corrupt leadership. We begin with the account in Num 16:1–17:13 before looking at the manner in which it is evoked in Ps 106(105):13–15. As the story starts, the Levite Korah and Reubenites Dathan and Abiram, along with 250 *ἀρχηγοὶ συναγωγῆς* (“leaders of the assembly”), confront Moses and Aaron with the claim that the entire assembly, everyone, is *ἅγιος* (“holy”), as the LORD is among them, and that Moses and Aaron, through improperly exalting themselves, have opposed this assembly of the LORD (Num 16:1–3). In response, Moses falls facedown and challenges Korah and company to put fire and incense into censers

whether the LXX’s *Vorlage* matched the MT at this point (see Melvyn D. Gray, “Psalm 106,15b: Did the Children Get What They Asked For?” *SJOT* 7 [1993]: 125–33; Smith, “Linguistic,” 160), the connection that inheres between LXX Ps 105:15b and LXX Exod 16:3, 8 is not present in the corresponding MT versions.

before the LORD tomorrow, καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀνὴρ, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξῃται κύριος, οὗτος ἅγιος (“and the one whom the LORD chooses, he shall be holy”; vv. 4–7). That Aaron shall do the same, implicit in this initial challenge, becomes explicit in the repetition of these instructions to Korah (vv. 16–17). Moreover, Moses’ attempted confrontation of Dathan and Abiram further clarifies that his leadership is also under attack (vv. 12–15). Indeed, describing *Egypt* as if it is the Promised Land, they ask Moses: μὴ μικρὸν τοῦτο ὅτι ἀνήγαγες ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς ῥεοῦσης γάλα καὶ μέλι ἀποκτεῖναι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ὅτι κατάρχεις ἡμῶν ἄρχων; (“It is not a minor matter, is that, you have led us up from a land flowing with milk and honey to kill us in the desert, since you lord over us as ruler?”; v. 13).

When the showdown with Korah and company takes place before the Tent of Testimony, the LORD warns Moses and Aaron, Ἀποσχίσθητε ἐκ μέσου τῆς συναγωγῆς ταύτης, καὶ ἐξαναλώσω αὐτοὺς εἰς ἅπαξ (“Separate from the midst of this assembly, and I will annihilate them at once”; v. 21). Interpreting “this assembly” as a reference to the entire congregation of Israel, Moses and Aaron fall on their faces and intercede with the question, εἰ ἄνθρωπος εἷς ἥμαρτεν, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν συναγωγὴν ὀργὴ κυρίου; (“If one person sins, shall the wrath of the LORD [come] upon the entire congregation?”; v. 22). The question proves effective. Only those involved in the uprising are punished. In accordance with Moses’ prediction in vv. 28–30 and as confirmation of his authority, ἠνοίχθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν (“the earth was opened and swallowed”) Korah and his family, ἐκάλυπεν αὐτοὺς ἡ γῆ (“the earth covered them”; vv. 32, 33). While Dathan, Abiram, and their families are not mentioned here, their inclusion is implied earlier (vv. 25–27).

As for the other accomplices, πῦρ ἐξῆλθεν παρὰ κυρίου καὶ κατέφαγεν τοὺς πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίους ἄνδρας (“fire went out from the LORD and consumed the 250 men”; v. 35).

At this point in the story, it is important to recognize that although the dispute concerns the holiness of the entire assembly, of everyone (cf. v. 1), the uprising so far has been confined to the recently deceased Korah and company. Indeed, the LORD’s positive response to the intercessory question of v. 22 underscores the innocence of ordinary Israelites. The only hint that anything might be amiss is that after the earth consumes Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ (“all Israel”), encircled around them, flees, fearing the same fate (v. 34).

Beginning in Num 16:41, however, the spread of the uprising becomes apparent as on the next day the Israelites ἐγόγγυσαν (“grumbled”) at Moses and Aaron and charged: Ὑμεῖς ἀπεκτάγκατε τὸν λαὸν κυρίου (“You killed the people of the LORD”). Finding themselves under threat, Moses and Aaron rush to the Tent of Testimony where the LORD tells them, Ἐκχωρήσατε ἐκ μέσου τῆς συναγωγῆς ταύτης, καὶ ἐξαναλώσω αὐτοὺς εἰς ᾗπαξ (“Depart from the midst of this assembly, and I will annihilate them at once”; v. 45), words that, apart from the initial verb, match v. 21 exactly. Moses and Aaron again fall upon their faces. Yet, this time, rather than interceding *on behalf of the innocent* to spare them from being punished with the guilty (cf. v. 22), they are instead interceding *on behalf of the guilty*. What happens next is that, in accordance with Moses’ instructions, Aaron hurriedly places altar-fire and incense upon a censer and runs into the camp to “propitiate” (ἐξιλάσκομαι) the “wrath” (ὀργή) of the LORD which had already

begun to “shatter” (θραύω) the people.²⁰ When this “shattering” (θραύσις) ceases, thanks to Aaron interposing himself between the dead and living, 14,700 Israelites are dead, not counting those who perished on account of Korah.

Finally, even as this cessation of the “shattering” implicitly demonstrates the authority of Aaron (and Moses), it remains for Aaron’s authority to be explicitly reaffirmed to those who grumbled against him (cf. Num 16:41), but were spared because of his propitiatory work. And so the uprising, which began with Korah and company and spread to the rest of the people, requires resolution to bring the story to a conclusion. This resolution occurs in Num 17:1–13. The LORD “chooses” (ἐκλέγομαι) to make Aaron’s staff bud, rather than one from another ancestral tribe, a choice intended to endorse Aaron definitively and thus end the remaining Israelites’ “grumbling” (γογγυσμός, γογγύζω) against Moses and Aaron (cf. Num 17:5, 10).

Turning now to Ps 106(105):16–18, we note that the allusion to the uprising initially emphasizes its effect on Moses and Aaron. Verse 16 states: καὶ παρώργισαν τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ, τὸν Ἀαρὼν τὸν ἅγιον κυρίου (“and they angered Moses in the camp, Aaron the holy one of the LORD”).²¹ The reference to Aaron as ἅγιος (“holy”) subtly recalls that Aaron’s sanctity, over against that of Korah and company, received decisive divine confirmation (cf. Num 16:3, 5, 7). This confirmation came, as v. 17

²⁰ On the term ἐξιλιάσκομαι and cognates, cf. n. 33.

²¹ On the deletion of καὶ and insertion of τὸν before Μωϋσῆν and Ἀαρὼν, in comparison to Rahlfs’s text, see Smith, “Linguistic,” 161–62. Smith (ibid.) also perceptively observes that in v. 16 the translator made the unprecedented choice, at least in the LXX, to render נִכְרַח with παροργίζω, instead of ζηλόω (as in Pss 37[36]:1; 73[72]:3) or παραζηλόω (as in Ps 78[77]:58). The result is a difference in meaning: “while the Hebrew Psalm alludes to the jealousy that occasioned the rebellion narrated in Numbers 16, the effect of G’s interpretation is to highlight Moyses’ and Aaron’s reaction rather than the people’s action (see also 4 Makk 2.17).”

observes, when ἡνοίχθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν Δαθὰν καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἐπὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν Ἀβιράων (“the earth was opened and swallowed Dathan and covered the assembly of Abiram”; cf. Num 16:25–27, 32, 33). Whereas in v. 11 water “covered” *Israel’s oppressors*, now in v. 17 the earth has “covered” *Israel’s leaders*, even if would-be ones. Verse 18, καὶ ἐξεκαύθη πῦρ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν, φλόξ κατέφλεξεν ἁμαρτωλούς (“and fire was ignited in their assembly, a flame consumed sinners”), also depicts the punishment of would-be leaders, not the people as a whole, in evoking the demise of Korah’s 250 accomplices (Num 16:35; cf. p. 209).

Conspicuously absent from Ps 106(105):16–18, however, is Korah himself, the primary instigator of the uprising. Although various explanations have been proposed for this absence,²² and Deut 11:6 provides precedent for mentioning Dathan and Abiram without Korah,²³ the omission has the effect of drawing attention to the two persons in the uprising story who, as we have seen (cf. p. 208 above), depict *Egypt* as a land flowing with milk and honey in the context of questioning Moses’ leadership (Num 16:12–14).²⁴ Thus rejection of the Promised Land, though still latent, is once again present in vv. 16–18, by virtue of omitting Korah to focus on Dathan and Abiram.

²² Dahood (*Psalms III: 101–150* [AB 17A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1970], 71) attributes Korah’s absence to “the psalmist’s desire to avoid possible confusion with ‘the sons of Korah’ to whom ten psalms are ascribed.” This explanation, of course, applies in the first instance to the MT and only secondarily to the LXX. Other scholars (e.g. Richardson, “Psalm 106,” 195; McCann Jr., “Book of Psalms,” 1111) suggest that the author of MT Ps 106 may have been working with an earlier form of the tradition than what is found in the Pentateuch, one that did not include Korah. On the question of whether MT Ps 106 presupposes a completed Pentateuch and its relevance for interpreting LXX Ps 105, cf. cf. n. 13.

²³ Cf. also Num 26:8–10, which includes all three.

²⁴ Cf. the characterization of Dathan and Abiram in Roetman and Hooft, “Psaume 106,” 240–41.

Significantly, Ps 106(105) does not continue its allusion to the uprising by recalling the grumbling of the people against Moses and Aaron and Aaron's subsequent propitiation (at Moses' prompting) of the LORD's shattering wrath (Num 16:41–50). Instead, Ps 106(105) moves on to a new episode, idolatrous calf worship at Horeb in vv. 19–23. Yet, the LXX version of the psalm, as we shall see, returns to Aaron's intercessory role in the uprising. I shall discuss this return when treating the central sin of the calf.

Heedless Grumbling in the Tents of Kadesh Barnea (vv. 24–27)

The fifth sin, heedless grumbling in tents (vv. 24–27), with one important exception, selectively evokes the parallel, though distinct, accounts of the Kadesh Barnea rebellion in Num 13:1–14:35 and Deut 1:19–46. Omitted from the Numbers account, for example, is the role of the wicked spies in fomenting Israelite fear of the giant inhabitants of the Land (cf. Num 13:31[32]–33[34]).²⁵ Instead, v. 24a draws attention to the people: καὶ ἐξουδένωσαν γῆν ἐπιθυμητήν (“And they despised the desired Land”).²⁶ Thus, following the turning point of the golden calf incident (cf. discussion on p. 224), what has been an implicit feature of the first three sins evoked in vv. 7–18 becomes explicit at once: Israel rejects the Promised Land.

Verse 24b provides the reason for rejecting the Land: οὐκ ἐπιστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ (“They did not believe his word”). The contrast with v. 12a is obvious. Less clear,

²⁵ The numbers in brackets indicate the versification for the Göttingen LXX critical edition, which for Num 13 differs by one from Rahlfs's LXX, the MT, and NRSV.

²⁶ As noted by Smith (“Linguistic,” 174), a connection with Num 14:31 is lost in LXX translation. The term **וַיִּשְׁמְדוּ** appears in both MT Num 14:31 and Ps 106:24, but is translated by ἀφίστημι in LXX Num 14:31 and by ἐξουδενέω in LXX Ps 105:24.

however, is the precise nature of the λόγος (“word”) in which the Israelites did not believe. The similarity to Deut 1:32, καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ οὐκ ἐνεπιστεύσατε κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν (“And in this word you did not believe the LORD your God”),²⁷ suggests that, in a narrow sense, the λόγος is Moses’ preceding assurance that the LORD would fight with Israel against the imposing inhabitants of the Land, an assurance underscored by the LORD’s deliverance from Egypt and nurturing care in the wilderness (cf. Deut 1:29–31). Yet, in a broader sense, the λόγος is the promise of Land-inheritance itself.

Verse 25a, καὶ ἐγόγγυσαν ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν (“And they grumbled in their tents”), evokes Deut 1:27, an earlier part of the same passage to which v. 24b appeals, and in so doing supplies the content of the Israelites’ grumbling. This content corroborates the interpretation proposed for v. 24b, reinforcing the now explicit theme: rejection of, or disbelief in, the Promised Land. Moses says to the Israelites in Deut 1:27:

Table 13. Deut 1:27

²⁷ καὶ διεγογγύσατε ἐν ταῖς σκηναῖς ὑμῶν καὶ εἶπατε Διὰ τὸ μισεῖν κύριον ἡμᾶς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, παραδοῦναι ἡμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας Ἀμορραίων, ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς.	²⁷ And you grumbled in your tents and said, “Because the LORD hates us, he led us out of the land of Egypt to give us into the hands of the Amorites, to destroy us.”
--	--

With Ps 106(105):25b, οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου (“they did not heed the voice of the LORD”), we find an allusion to the Num 14:22, οὐκ εἰσήκουσάν μου τῆς φωνῆς (“they did not heed my voice”),²⁸ one that prepares for the punishment narrated in vv. 26–27. Yet, comparison with the context of Numbers shows how selective and even polemical the punitive dimension of vv. 26–27 proves to be. In Num 14:20–38 (as well as

²⁷ Cf. also Num 14:11.

²⁸ Cf. also Deut 1:43, 45; 9:23.

for the most part in Deut 1:32–40), the Israelites, saved from destruction by Moses’ intercession (cf. Num 14:10–19),²⁹ are condemned to wander for forty years in the wilderness (one year for each day the spies spent in the Land) until all of the adults, except for Caleb and Joshua, perish. At that point, the children of the Exodus generation, along with Caleb and Joshua, will inherit the Land.

The account of the Kadesh Barnea rebellion in Ps 106(105):24–27, however, fails to mention any inheritance, whether that of Caleb and Joshua, or that of the children. Instead, vv. 26–27 focus solely on punishment. Still more striking is that what at first appears to be an expected reference to the forty-year period of wilderness wandering becomes, by the end, a telescoped allusion to Exile, as the parallels between vv. 26–27 and Ezek 20:23, the important exception mentioned earlier, make clear:³⁰

Table 14. Ezek 20:23 and Ps 106(105):26–27

Ezek 20:23	Ps 106(105):26–27
²³ καὶ ἐξῆρα τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ διασκορπίσαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ διασπεῖραι αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς χώραις...	²⁶ καὶ ἐπῆρεν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ αὐτοῖς τοῦ καταβαλεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ²⁷ καὶ τοῦ καταβαλεῖν τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ διασκορπίσαι αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς χώραις.
²³ And I raised my hand against them in the desert to disperse them among the	²⁶ And he raised his hand at them to cast them into the desert

²⁹ Deut 1:26ff., however, lacks the Mosaic intercession of Num 14:10–19. Ps 106(105) also lacks, or rather omits, this intercession, thereby restricting the parallelism concerning salvific interventions to vv. 7–12, 19–23, and 28–31.

³⁰ As Smith (“Linguistic,” 177) observes, the LXX translation of נָשָׂא with ἐκτείνω in Num 14:30 but with ἐπαίρω in Ps 105:26 obscures a parallel in the MT. In spite of this difference between the LXX and MT, Allen (*Psalms 101–150*, 72), commenting on the MT, points to the particular importance of Ezek 20:23 for vv. 26–27. Scholars who recognize an allusion to the Exile, in general, in v. 27 include: Erik Haglund, *Historical Motifs in the Psalms* (ConBOT 23; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1984), 66; Richardson, “Psalm 106,” 197; Schaefer, *Psalms*, 263–64; Judith Gärtner, “The Torah in Psalm 106: Interpretations of JHWH’s Saving Act at the Red Sea,” in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms* (ed. Erich Zenger; BETL 238; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 479–88[483].

nations and to scatter them among the countries	²⁷ and to cast their seed among the nations and to disperse them among the countries .
--	---

In view of Ezek 20:23, the polemical thrust of vv. 26–27 seems to be that the descendants of the Exodus generation, including the wilderness children, are cut from the same cloth as their forefathers. Sin spreads from one generation to the next. Indeed, even though suffering the consequences of their parents’ spiritual πορνεία (“fornication”; Num 14:33), the wilderness children, toward the end of their years of wandering, nonetheless committed their own spiritual πορνεία in the process of engaging in physical acts as well.³¹ Appropriately, then, the next episode in Ps 106(105) alludes to this affair.

Initiation into Baal of Peor and Phinehas’ Propitiation (vv. 28–31)

The primary, though not exclusive, background for the sixth sin in vv. 28–31 is Num 25:1–18. This text details what happened to the then adult wilderness generation, toward the end of their years of wandering. With terms or phrases that are important for Ps 106(105) in bold, Num 25:1–3 begins the story as follows:

Table 15. Num 25:1–3

¹ Καὶ κατέλυσεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Σαττίμ· καὶ ἐβεβηλώθη ὁ λαὸς ἐκπορνεῦσαι εἰς τὰς θυγατέρας Μωάβ. ² καὶ ἐκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς θυσίας τῶν εἰδώλων αὐτῶν , καὶ ἔφαγεν ὁ λαὸς τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν , καὶ προσεκύνησαν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν . ³ καὶ ἐτελέσθη Ἰσραὴλ τῷ Βεελφεγὼρ · καὶ ὠργίσθη θυμῷ κύριος τῷ Ἰσραήλ.	¹ And Israel stayed in Shittim: and the people desecrated themselves by fornicating with the daughters of Moab. ² And they [Moabite daughters] invited them to their idol sacrifices , and the people ate of their sacrifices , and they worshiped their idols . ³ And Israel was initiated into Baal of Peor : and the LORD became enraged with wrath at Israel.
---	---

³¹ On the word-group of which πορνεία is a part, including metaphorical usage, see Friedrich Hauck and Seigfried Schulz, “πόρνη, πόρνος, πορνεία, πορνεύω, ἐκπορνεύω,” *TDNT* 6:579–595.

As the story continues, Moses attempts to avert the LORD's wrath by telling the tribes of Israel that those initiated into Baal of Peor should be killed by their family members (Num 25:4–5). At least one man, however does the exact opposite. Rather than killing family members who had been initiated into Baal of Peor, he instead fosters further fornication by bringing his brother to a Midianite woman in front of Moses and the Israelite assembly,³² who are weeping before the Tent of the Testimony. In response, Phinehas, the priest, son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron, takes a barbed lance and slays this Israelite man and his Midianite woman, stopping the “plague” (πληγή) that had broken out and limiting its death toll to 24,000 (vv. 6–9). The LORD then rewards Phinehas for his “propitiatory” (ἐξιλάσκομαι) act,³³ granting him an eternal priestly covenant for his zeal (vv. 10–13), and the account concludes with the names of the fornicating couple as well as a divine mandate for Israelite enmity toward the Midianites (vv. 14–18).

Turning to Ps 106(105), the references to initiation and sacrificial eating in v. 28 allude to Num 25:1–3; and, in so doing, produce metaleptic resonances of the

³² Contrary to the LXX, MT Num 25:6 says that an Israelite man brought a Midianite woman to his brothers (i.e., family). Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, 422) attributes this difference to a transposition of לָאֵל and אֶלָּא. See his explanation for details.

³³ Dirk Büchner (“Εξιλάσασθαι: Appeasing God in the Septuagint Pentateuch,” *JBL* 129 [2010]: 237–60[237]) observes: “The simplex verb ἱλάσκομαι and its compound ἐξιλάσκομαι indicate in Greek literature the action ‘appease,’ ‘placate,’ ‘propitiate,’ and are found in both the religious and secular realms. The word group ... expresses the process by which a person could restore to kindness an aggrieved deity or fellow mortal, who would typically appear as the direct object of the verb.” Büchner goes on to argue convincingly against the claim, common among LXX scholars, that, in light of its Hebrew counterpart כִּפֶּר, this word-group may be understood in the sense of to “purge” or “expiate” sin. He instead proposes that, faced with the multiple occasions in the LXX in which the verb is followed by a prepositional phrase and lacks a direct object (e.g. Num 25:13), something for which there is virtually no precedent outside of biblical literature, “Greek speakers would in all likelihood have recognized an abbreviated formula with a deity understood” (p. 254).

“fornication” (ἐκπορνεύω) and “idol-worship” (προσεκύνησαν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν) associated with Baal of Peor. Verse 29 offers subtle but significant corroboration for discerning such metaleptic resonances. While utilizing other words to recall the plague of Num 25:8–9 that took 24,000 lives, the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν (“in their practices”) also, in retrospect, performs another role within the psalm. This same expression recurs in v. 39b, where, as we shall see, it refers to Israel’s spiritual “fornication” (πορνεύω) through idol-worship and ritualistic child sacrifice. Thus the Baal of Peor episode in Ps 106(105), an episode about those who did inherit the Land, through metaleptic resonances with Num 25:1–3 and a preparatory phrase, implicitly deems the wilderness generation as nonetheless unworthy of the Land. Indeed, as the rest of the psalm makes clear, similar behavior by their descendants led to the defilement and eventual loss of the Land.

Verses 30–31, in contrast, provide hope of an enduring righteous lineage by invoking Phinehas’ propitiatory intervention. Yet, absent from these verses are prominent elements from the account in Num 25:11–13, including Phinehas’ zeal and the priestly nature of the covenant that is restricted to his descendants.³⁴ Moreover, v. 31a, proves to be an exact match in the LXX with Gen 15:6b: καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην (“and [it] was reckoned to him for righteousness”).³⁵ At first, Phinehas’ “propitiation” (ἐξιλάσκομαι) in v. 30a seems to be an unambiguous reference to the latter part of Num 25:13: καὶ ἐξιλάσατο περὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ (“and he made propitiation for the children

³⁴ For texts evoking Phinehas’ zeal, cf. 1 Macc 2:26, 54; 4 Macc 18:12; Sir 45:23.

³⁵ The only difference in the MT is that in Gen 15:6b עָשָׂה is active, with God as the implied subject.

of Israel”). This is because MT Ps 106:30a presents Phinehas as prayerfully “interceding” (פלל), not performing propitiation. Thus Jan Joosten, discussing v. 30a under the heading of “Assimilation to the Greek Pentateuch,” suggests that the translation here has probably been influenced by LXX Num 25:13.³⁶

Counting against Joosten’s suggestion, however, is the rendering of מגפה (“blow, slaughter, plague”).³⁷ In MT Ps 106, מגפה occurs twice in vv. 29b and 30b. The term πτωσις (“fall, falling”) renders the first instance and θραύσις (“shattering, destruction, slaughter”) the second, thus obscuring the lexical parallelism of the MT. If the LXX Psalms translator had been influenced by LXX Num 25, one would have expected him to translate מגפה with πληγή (“blow, wound, plague”), as it is rendered in LXX Num 25:8, 9. Instead, for v. 30b he chose θραύσις, the term used to translate מגפה in Num 16:48, 49, 50. The result, as we shall see when discussing the central sin of the calf, is that, even more so than Moses’ intervention (v. 23b–c), Phinehas’ propitiation (v. 30) matches that of Aaron in Num 16:46–50. This is not to exclude any relationship with Num 25. After all, in addition to the similarity between vv. 28–29 and Num 25:1–3, noted above, Phinehas’ propitiation in v. 30a recalls, at least to some degree, the sacrificial slaying of

³⁶ Joosten, “Impact,” 201–3. So also Flashar, “Exegetische,” 183–84; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 65. In a previous publication (Alec J. Lucas, “Unearthing an Intra-Jewish Interpretive Debate? Romans 1:18–2:4; Wisdom of Solomon 11–19; and Psalms 105[104]–107[106],” *Annali di Storia dell’Esegesi* 27 [2010]: 69–91[80, n. 32]), I tacitly endorsed Joosten’s suggestion.

³⁷ In the MT, מגפה occurs 26x in 25 verses. The LXX translates מגפה as follows: ἀπώλεια, 1x (1 Chr 21:17); θραύσις, 8x (Num 16:48, 49, 50; 2 Sam 17:9; 18:7; 2 Sam 24:21, 25; Ps 106[105]:30); παράταξις, 1x (Ezek 24:16); πληγή, 9x (Num 14:37; 25:8, 9, 18; 19[26:1]; 31:16; 1 Sam 4:17; 1 Chr 21:22; 2 Chr 21:14); πταῖσμα, 1x (1 Sam 6:4); πτωσις, 5x (Ps 106[105]:29; Zech 14:12, 15[2x], 18); συνάντημα, 1x (Exod 9:14).

the Israelite man and his Midianite mistress in Num 25:8. It is rather to suggest that the evidence of “Assimilation to the Greek Pentateuch” points instead to Num 16.³⁸

Inciting Moses at the Water of Strife (vv. 32–33)

The seventh sin in vv. 32–33, especially through the reference to ὕδατος ἀντιλογίας (“Water of Strife”), alludes to Num 20:1–13, the incident in which Moses was banned from the Promised Land for twice striking a rock to bring forth water, rather than merely speaking to the rock as the LORD had commanded him. The original account and subsequent evocations (cf. Num 20:12, 13; 27:14; Deut 32:51) stress Moses’ failure to “sanctify” (ἀγιάζω) the LORD through either his disbelief in or disobedience to the divine word. Ps 106(105), however, taking a sympathetic perspective to Moses, blames the people for what happened (cf. Deut 1:37; 3:26). Indeed, the Israelites παρώργισαν αὐτόν ... καὶ ἐκακώθη Μωυσῆς δι’ αὐτούς (“angered him ... and Moses was harmed on their account”; v. 32). The result is that Moses διέστειλεν ἐν τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτοῦ (“divided his lips”), an ambiguous expression that need not be negative (cf. Ps 66[65]:14), although here it likely refers to Moses’ presumptuous question in Num 20:10, one in which he elevates himself and Aaron to the place of the LORD: Ἀκούσατέ μου, οἱ ἀπειθεῖς· μὴ ἐκ τῆς πέτρας ταύτης ἐξάξομεν ὑμῖν ὕδωρ; (“Hear me, you disobedient ones: We shall not, from this rock, bring forth water for you, shall we?”).

In conclusion, it is interesting to observe that v. 33a attributes the cause of this presumptuous question to the people’s “embitterment” (παραπικραίνω) of Moses’ spirit.

³⁸ Joosten (“Impact,” 203, n. 18) discerns the influence of Num 16 (identified according to the versification in Rahlfs’s LXX as Num 17:12–15) on v. 23 but not on v. 30. Smith (“Linguistic,” 173, 183–84), however, discerns the influence on both verses.

Thus the “embitterment” of Israel that began at the Red Sea (cf. v. 7) has now made its way even to Moses, depriving him of the opportunity to lead the people into the Land. Accordingly, vv. 34–46, omitting Joshua’s role in the conquest, portray the Israelites of the Judges period as susceptible and ultimately subservient to Gentile influence, made possible by their own disobedience (cf. v. 34).

Analysis of Fourth Sin: Calf Worship at Horeb and Moses’ Intercession (vv. 19–23)

Centrality of Calf Worship: Positional, Terminological, Intertextual, and Thematic

We finally come to calf worship at Horeb and Moses’ intercession in vv. 19–23, centrally positioned as the fourth of seven sins outside of the Land (vv. 7–12, 13–15, 16–18, 19–23, 24–27, 28–31, 32–33) and as the middle of three sins that include a salvific intervention (vv. 7–12, 19–23, 28–31). These verses include elements from Exod 32–34, Deut 9:7–10:11, and, as noted, Num 16:41–50. I shall defer extended treatment of these textual relations, especially the former two, in order to focus first on the terminological, intertextual, and thematic centrality of vv. 19–23, in addition to their positional centrality.

With regard to terminology, vv. 19–23 look forward and backward in the psalm to Israel’s sin. An initial forward glance emerges from comparing v. 19 to vv. 36a, 38c:³⁹

Table 16. Ps 106(105):19, 36a, 38c

¹⁹ καὶ ἐποίησαν μόσχον ἐν Χωρήβ καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ γλυπτῷ.	¹⁹ And they made a calf at Horeb and they worshiped the graven image .
---	---

³⁹ So also Smith (“Linguistic,” 167), who notes: “G.’s choice of γλυπτός is independent of the Pentateuch (which has χωνευτός in Ex 32.4 and consistently uses γλυπτός for פסל / פסיל ‘image’), and its equation with עֲצָבִים occurs nowhere else in the LXX. The result is a lexical link, absent in the Hebrew, to Israel’s later sin of worshipping the Canaanite images in verses 36 and 38, where γλυπτός reappears for עֲצָבִים ‘idol.’” Given that the translation of עֲצָבִים with γλυπτός is unprecedented in the LXX, it seems likely that the LXX translator intended to link vv. 19, 36a, and 38c together, perhaps strengthening a conceptual connection he discerned in the MT.

^{36a} καὶ ἐδούλευσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς αὐτῶν....	^{36a} And they served their [the Gentiles'] graven images
^{38c} ... ὧν ἔθυσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς Χανάαν....	^{38c} ... whom they sacrificed to the graven images of Canaan....

Israel's idolatrous impulses, which first manifested themselves at Horeb, at least according to the psalm,⁴⁰ proved to be her downfall once she failed to destroy the Gentiles and mixed with them in Canaan (cf. vv. 34–46. and discussion on pp. 272ff.).

Following the mini-*inclusio* of μόσχος (“calf”) in vv. 19a, 20b,⁴¹ there is a glance in the opposite direction as vv. 21–22 recall vv. 7–12 to stress that, in creating the calf, Israel once again (cf. v. 13) forgot the God who saved her at the Red Sea. The following table shows the numerous parallels between these verses:

Table 17. Ps 106(105):7–10, 21–22

⁷ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ οὐ συνῆκαν τὰ θαυμάσιά σου, οὐκ ἐμνήσθησαν τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ ἐλέους σου καὶ παρεπίκραναν ἀναβαίνοντες ἐν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ . ⁸ καὶ ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς ... ⁹ καὶ ἐπετίμησεν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ ... ¹⁰ καὶ ἔσωσεν αὐτούς....	⁷ Our fathers in Egypt did not understand your wonders , <i>they did not remember</i> the multitude of your mercy and they became embittered when they went up to the Red Sea . ⁸ And he saved them ... ⁹ And he rebuked the Red Sea ... ¹⁰ And he saved them....
²¹ ἐπελάθοντο τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ σώζοντος αὐτούς, τοῦ ποιήσαντος μεγάλα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ²² θαυμαστὰ ἐν γῇ Χάμ, φοβερὰ ἐπὶ θαλάσσης ἐρυθρᾶς .	²¹ <i>They forgot</i> the God who saved them, who did great things in Egypt , ²² wonders in the land of Ham, fearful things upon the Red Sea .

⁴⁰ In contrast, Josh 24:14 and Ezek 20:7–9 attribute idolatry to Israel in Egypt. On the similarities between the latter text and Ps 106(105):7–12, cf. n. 11.

⁴¹ Whereas in LXX Ps 105 this mini-*inclusio* in vv. 19a, 20b is formed by lexical repetition, in MT Ps 106 it is formed by semantic parallelism: לָגַל and שָׁוָר respectively.

Unlike embitterment at the Red Sea, however, the golden calf incident was severe enough to require a mediator. And so v. 23 recounts Moses' mediation, with ἐξολεθρεύω ("destroy") functioning as an *inclusio* for this extended verse. Although ἐξολεθρεύω, as we shall see, serves as a crucial link to Deut 9:7–10:11, the depiction of Moses' intercession in between subtly continues the evocation of Korah's uprising at the very point at which vv. 16–18 stopped. That brings us to the intertextual centrality of the account.

We saw above that vv. 16–18 allude to Dathan, Abiram, and the fiery death of the 250 accomplices, but do not then recall the grumbling of the people against Moses and Aaron and Aaron's subsequent propitiation (at Moses' prompting) of the LORD's shattering wrath (Num 16:41–50). Notably absent from vv. 16–18 are any of the following lexical parallels concerning Aaron's intercessory role in Num 16:46–50:

Table 18. Num 16:46–50

⁴⁶ ... καὶ ἐξίλασαι περὶ αὐτῶν· ἐξῆλθεν γὰρ ὀργὴ ἀπο προσώπου κυρίου, ἤρκειται θραύειν τὸν λαόν.	⁴⁶ ... and make propitiation for them: for wrath has gone out from the presence of the LORD, [it] has begun to shatter the people.
⁴⁷ ... καὶ ἤδη ἐνῆρκετο ἡ θραῦσις ἐν τῷ λαῷ· καὶ ἐπέβαλεν [Ααρών] τὸ θυμίαμα καὶ ἐξίλάσατο περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ·	⁴⁷ ... and already the shattering had begun among the people: and [Aaron] added the incense and made propitiation for the people.
⁴⁸ καὶ ἔστη ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν τεθνηκότων καὶ τῶν ζώντων, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραῦσις.	⁴⁸ And he stood in the midst of the dead and of the living, and the shattering ceased .
⁴⁹ καὶ ... οἱ τεθνηκότες ἐν τῇ θραύσει....	⁴⁹ And ... those who died in the shattering
⁵⁰ ... καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραῦσις.	⁵⁰ ... and the shattering ceased .

Yet, these lexical parallels, with especially significant terms and phrases in bold, even if absent from vv. 16–18, prove crucial for interpreting the LXX psalm. Aaron’s intercessory role first returns, by way of partial transfer, to that of Moses in v. 23.⁴² The following terms in bold indicate this partial transfer:

Table 19. Partial Transfer of Aaronic Intercession in Ps 106(105):23

²³ καὶ εἶπεν τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι αὐτούς, εἰ μὴ Μωϋσῆς ὁ ἐκλεκτός αὐτοῦ ἔστη ἐν τῇ θραύσει ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι τὴν ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ μὴ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι.	²³ And he spoke in order to destroy them, except that Moses his chosen one stood in the shattering before him to turn away his wrath in order that he would not destroy [them].
---	--

Comparison of these two tables suggests that the phrase “stood in the shattering” recalls Aaron’s intercession, as does the reference to the “wrath” that was averted, although this is less clear since “wrath” (ὀργή) is a common word, one that appears in the two other texts that form the intertextual background to vv. 19–23 (cf. Exod 32:10, 11, 12; Deut 9:19). Interestingly, “chosen” (ἐκλεκτός) as a designation may also reflect a transfer of Aaron’s priestly status to Moses. The cognate verb ἐκλέγομαι (“choose”) appears three times in Num 16:5, 7; 17:5 and the LORD’s choice of Aaron is a key component of the uprising account.

Any inclination to suspect that these similarities are mere coincidence is undermined by the more complete transfer of Aaron’s intercessory role to that of his grandson, Phinehas, in v. 30. Once again, the terms in bold indicate this transfer:

⁴² This transfer is not present in MT Ps 106:23. The phrase עָמַד בַּפֶּרֶץ recalls Ezek 22:30 and פָּרִץ is rendered by θραῦσις nowhere else in the LXX. So Smith, “Linguistic,” 173. Verse 23 seems to be another example of assimilation to LXX Num 16. See the discussion of v. 30 on p. 217 and immediately below. Note, however, that there is also a partial parallel between LXX Ps 105:23 and Deut 10:10.

Table 20. More Complete Transfer of Aaronic Intercession in Ps 106(105):30

³⁰ καὶ ἔστη Φινεῆς καὶ ἐξιλίασατο, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ἡ θραῦσις....	³⁰ And Phinehas stood and made propitiation, and the shattering ceased....
---	--

The only word that does not find an exact parallel in Num 16:46–50 is the name “Phinehas.” Moreover, the phrase “and the shattering ceased” in v. 30b occurs twice in Num 16:48, 50. The result of this double transfer of Aaron’s intercessory role is that the depiction of Moses in v. 23b–c, while picking up where the allusion in vv. 16–18 left off, also looks forward to that of Phinehas in v. 30. Thus the intertextual centrality of the golden calf incident is underscored.

Finally, there is the thematic centrality of vv. 19–23. The partial transfer to Moses and later more complete transfer to Phinehas of Aaron’s intercessory role suggests that the golden calf incident both participates in and serves as a turning point for thematic progression related to the severity of Israel’s sin and the LORD’s corresponding reaction to that sin in vv. 7–33. Beginning with vv. 7–12, the LORD’s salvific parting of the Red Sea for his name’s sake, an act that did not require a mediator, turned Israel from “embitterment” to faith and praise (vv. 7, 12). Even if Israel then quickly forgot the LORD’s works, the framing elements of Exod 16:1–36 in vv. 13a and 15b, over and against the reference to Num 11:4 in v. 14a, as noted above, suggest that vv. 13–15 recall the LORD’s gracious provision in response to illicit desire. Sin has returned, in other words, but it is not yet severe enough to require punishment.

In vv. 16–18, however, sin is severe enough to require punishment, but, as indicated by the selective evocation of Korah’s uprising, it is limited to Israel’s corrupt leaders, who, like Israel’s enemies at the Red Sea, are “covered” (cf. vv. 11a, 17b). Only

in vv. 19–23 does sin, *severe enough to require recompense*, spread to the people as a whole. That is the hermeneutical significance of partially transferring Aaron’s intercessory role to Moses. In Num 16:41–50, Aaron’s intercession, as that of Moses in vv. 19–23, is on behalf of the whole people. In the progression of the psalm, depravity, so to speak, does not become democratized until Israel comes to Horeb and creates a calf.⁴³ Of course, in the temporal sequence of the Pentateuch, Israel had already been to Horeb prior to the uprising of Korah and company. This chronological displacement of the golden calf incident to a central position, one in which *recompense-requiring sin* first afflicts the *people as a whole*, only serves to highlight its importance as a turning point all the more.⁴⁴

Yet even if a turning point, the golden calf incident as recounted in vv. 19–23 is not the apex of sin in the psalm. The rejection of the Promised Land, implicit in the accounts evoked prior to the calf, becomes explicit immediately afterward in vv. 24–27. Moreover, punishment now includes a telescoped reference to Exile. The appropriateness of such punishment is then justified by an allusion to the wilderness generation’s spiritual

⁴³ Another indication of this democratization is that the people, rather than Aaron (cf. Exod 32:4, 35; though cf. also Exod 32:8, 20, 31), are portrayed as corporately making (ἐποίησαν) the calf. The omission of Aaron’s role is consistent with the sympathetic stance taken towards Moses in vv. 32–33. Cf. the discussion on p. 219.

⁴⁴ The golden calf incident of vv. 19–23 is not the only episode in Ps 106(105) that is chronologically displaced from its position in the sequence of the Pentateuch. Thus, for example, while vv. 16–18 evoke Num 16:1–40, the later vv. 24–27 allude to the earlier Pentateuchal account of Num 14:1–38. Moreover, vv. 28–31 and vv. 32–33 correspond to Num 25:1–18 and Num 20:1–13 respectively. Further complicating matters is that the episodes in Ps 106(105) often include elements from other scriptural texts, especially parallel Pentateuchal accounts in Deuteronomy. Thus vv. 19–23 evoke both Exod 32–34 and Deut 9:7–10:11; similarly, vv. 24–27 allude to Num 14:1–38 as well as Deut 1:26–36. Yet, in spite of such sequential complexity, it is nonetheless significant that the golden calf incident of vv. 19–23 occupies the central position in the seven sins of vv. 7–33 and that its placement at this position requires a departure, even if one of several, from the sequence of the Pentateuch. On the relationship of Ps 106(105) to the Pentateuch, cf. cf. n. 13.

and physical fornication at Baal of Peor in vv. 28–31. The more complete transfer of Aaron’s intercessory role to that of Phinehas, one not just of mediation but of propitiation, reflects the increase of sin. Lastly, with vv. 32–33, sin, *severe enough to require recompense*, spreads even to Moses himself, leaving Israel without his guidance in the Land, the outcome of which is recounted in vv. 34–46.

Exegesis, Comparison, Conflation: Exodus 32–34, Deuteronomy 9–10, Psalm 106(105):19–20, 23a,d

Prior to looking at vv. 34–46, however, we must return to the intertextual nature of vv. 19–23, with particular attention now to the way in which the accounts of the calf in Exodus 32–34 and Deut 9–10 have been conflated. Moreover, since these accounts are important to the subsequent analysis of Rom 2:5–11 in chapter five and the larger context sketched in chapter six, I shall engage in an extended treatment of them here, both individually and in comparison to one another, before finally concluding with the manner in which they have been integrated into Ps 106(105):19–23. Accordingly, this subsection is divided into four parts corresponding to these aims.

Exegesis of Exodus 32–34. Exod 32–34 provides the original account of Israel’s most egregious sin—idolatrous worship of a golden calf in the midst of receiving the Law—and the LORD’s most dramatic act of forgiveness, thanks to the repeated and interrelated intercession of Moses.⁴⁵ These chapters may be outlined as follows:

⁴⁵ The following statement by Nathan MacDonald (“Recasting the Golden Calf: The Imaginative Potential of the Old Testament’s Portrayal of Idolatry,” in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity* [ed. Stephen C. Barton; London: T & T Clark, 2007], 22–39[24]) about MT Exod 32 holds for MT Exod 32–34 as a whole: “Literary critical analysis has discerned strands of J and E, a Deuteronomistic hand, and even priestly additions, making this one of the most complex parts of the Pentateuch.” Brevard S. Childs (*The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974], 610, 609 respectively), for example, attributes the decisive stage in the

- I. Israel's Idolatry in the Camp (32:1–6)
- II. Moses' First Intercession on the Mountain (32:7–14)
- III. Moses' Descent and Actions in the Camp (32:15–29)
 - A. Descent with Tablets and Conversation with Joshua (32:15–18)
 - B. Arrival and Destruction of Tablets and Calf (32:19–20)
 - C. Confrontation of Aaron (32:21–24)
 - D. Levitical Slaughter and Blessing (32:25–29)

formation of Exod 32–34 to the “wide use of ... older literary sources” by a JE redactor, whose own work was then supplemented by a Deuteronomic editor. Although Childs does not assign any part to P, he notes that Exod 34:29–35 “has been almost always assigned to the Priestly source during the period of classic literary criticism (Wellhausen, Dillmann, Bāntsch, Driver).” For a recent literary-critical analysis of MT Exod 32–34, see William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 539–623.

In contrast to these literary-critical approaches, Christine E. Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories: The Relationship of Exodus 32 and Deuteronomy 9–10,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* [ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 45–93[48]) engages in a narrative-critical analysis of MT Exod 32–34, along with MT Deut 9–10, one in which she argues that “literary unity neither requires nor assumes the lack of ambiguity, ambivalence, contradiction, and tension since these are tools of the narrative artist’s trade....” Hayes, for example, rather than positing a textual suture to explain the rare phenomenon of God’s double-speech to Moses in Exod 32:7–8 and 32:9–10, as do some critical scholars, instead argues that “The two speeches function together to generate the dramatic highpoint of the entire story, for in the interstice between these two speeches, we sense that Israel’s fate hangs in the balance and Moses—the only hope for Israel’s salvation—stands frozen and unresponding” (see pp. 55–56).

Significantly, this phenomenon of double-speech in MT Exod 32:7–8, 9–10 is absent from its LXX counterpart, due to what John William Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* [SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990], 523; “The Earliest Witness to Jewish Exegesis,” in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, vol. 1 [ed. Bary Walfish; Haifa: Haifa University, 1993], 115–27[119]) regards as an intentional omission of MT Exod 32:9. Although Wevers provides a different explanation for the omission, related to the characterization עַם־קִשְׁה־עָרָף in MT Exod 32:9, it is possible that the LXX translator omitted the verse in order to remove the double-speech and so streamline the narrative. If so, then this would be one of several examples of hermeneutically significant changes that were apparently made by the LXX translator of Exod 32–34 either to clarify the narrative or to reduce, if not eliminate, its tensions—the very lack of clarity and tensions seized upon by critical scholars to posit the presence of different sources. Other examples include: καὶ εἶπεν for וַיֹּאמֶר in 32:4, thereby attributing the declaration “These are your gods...” to Aaron, rather than to the people, thus heightening Aaron’s role in the golden calf incident and abating initial ambiguity surrounding that role; shortening the text of 33:4–5 to remove the awkward doublet concerning ornament removal; adding αὐτοῦ to modify σκηνὴν in 33:7, thereby suggesting that the tent was Moses’ own rather than the Tabernacle, which, according to the Exodus narrative, had not yet been constructed (cf. Exod 40); translating the reference in 33:11 to Moses speaking to the LORD אֱלֹהֵי־פָנִים with ἐνώπιος ἐνώπιω, rather than πρόσωπον προσώπω, to avoid conflict with the LORD telling Moses in 33:20, “you cannot see my face (פָּנִי/μου τὸ πρόσωπον), for no person may see it/my face and live”; and, finally, translating כָּל־טוֹרִי with τῇ δόξῃ μου in the LORD’s answer to Moses in 33:19 so that it better matches Moses’ request to see the LORD’s כְּבוֹד/δόξα in 33:18. See also Scott J. Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 242–54.

- IV. Moses' Second Intercession on the Mountain (32:30–33:6)
 - A. Sin and Punishment (32:30–35)
 - B. Divine Absence and Disrobing of Glory (33:1–6)
- V. Moses' Third Intercession in the Tent (33:7–34:3)
 - A. Setting, Intercessory Participants, and Pious Observers (33:7–11)
 - B. Tripartite Intercession (33:12–34:3)
 - a. Moses' Favor and Divine Presence (33:12–17)
 - b. Requesting Theophany (33:18–23)
 - c. Closing Preparatory Instructions (34:1–3)
- VI. Moses' Fourth Intercession on the Mountain (34:4–28)
 - A. Restoration and Transformation (34:4–11)
 - c.' Fulfillment of Preparatory Instructions (34:4)
 - b.' Receiving Theophany (34:5–7)
 - a.' Moses' Favor and Divine Presence (34:8–11)
 - B. Covenant Fidelity (34:12–16)
 - C. Covenantal Commandments (34:17–26)
 - D. Conclusion (34:27–28)
- VII. Moses' Glorified Descent and the Veil (34:29–35)

To understand just how egregious Israel's idolatry with the calf was, according to the narrative framework of Exodus, requires that we begin in chapter 24. Following the giving of the Ten Commandments at Sinai (Exod 20:1–17) and laws that constitute the “Book of the Covenant” (20:22–23:33), the very first of which includes the prohibition θεοὺς χρυσοῦς οὐ ποιήσετε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς (“golden gods you shall not make for yourselves”; v. 23b), Exod 24:3–8 recounts a covenant ratification ceremony. In the ceremony, Moses ᾠκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον (“built an altar”), presented ὅλοκαυτώματα (“whole burnt offerings”) as well as a θυσίαν σωτηρίου (“sacrifice of deliverance”), and read the Book of the Covenant to the people, who responded, for the second time, Πάντα, ὅσα ἐλάλησεν κύριος, ποιήσομεν καὶ ἀκουσόμεθα (“Everything, as much as the LORD

has said, we will do and heed”; v. 7; cf. v. 3). This ceremony concludes with Moses sprinkling blood on the people to seal the covenant. Following the ratification ceremony, Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders “saw the place where the God of Israel stood”⁴⁶ and shared a covenant meal: ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον (“they ate and drank”; vv. 9–11). Afterward, leaving Aaron and Hur in charge of the Israelite camp, Moses and Joshua ascended Sinai so that Moses alone could enter into the cloud of God’s glory and receive the covenant tablets, following a period of forty days and nights (Exod 24:12–31:18).

Exod 32:1–6 tells what happened in the camp during Moses’ prolonged absence.

The people demanded that Aaron:

Table 21. Exod 32:1b

^{1b} Ἀνάστηθι καὶ ποίησον ἡμῖν θεούς, οἳ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν· ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ.	^{1b} Arise and make gods for us, who will go before us; for that man Moses, who led us out of Egypt, we do not know what has happened to him.
--	--

The people’s demand introduces two themes that become prominent in Exod 32–34: the issue of who led Israel out of Egypt (Moses, other gods, or the LORD); and the issue of who will go before Israel into the Land (other gods, an angel, or the LORD).

Aaron, rather than rebuking the people, accedes to their demand and, in turn, issues the following command, with which the people promptly comply:

⁴⁶ This phrase in Exod 24:10 represents another instance in which the LXX translator sought to remove tension in the MT. As Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 384) observes: “What MT actually says, ‘And they saw the God of Israel,’ seems to be contradicted by 33:20: ‘for man cannot see my face and live.’ So Exod interprets MT to mean καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστίκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.” Cf. n. 45.

Table 22. Command and Compliance in Exod 32:2b–3

^{2b} Περιέλεσθε τὰ ἐνώτια τὰ χρυσᾶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν τῶν γυναικῶν ὑμῶν καὶ θυγατέρων, καὶ ἐνέγκατε πρὸς με.	^{2b} Take off the golden earrings in the ears of your wives and daughters, and bring [them] to me.
³ καὶ περιείλαντο πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τὰ ἐνώτια τὰ χρυσᾶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὠσίν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤνεγκαν πρὸς Ἀαρών.	³ And all the people took off the golden earrings in their ears, and brought [them] to Aaron.

These two verses heighten the dramatic irony. Aaron’s command introduces the term χρυσοῦς (“golden”), clarifying even further that the people’s demand directly contravenes the prohibition of Exod 20:23b. The immediate and exact compliance to Aaron’s command, indicated through lexical repetition (see the bold and italicized script above),⁴⁷ increases the irony still more since the people are portrayed as quite capable of obedience, precisely in their covenantal disobedience. Moreover, it is not just a portion of the people who are implicated, but all of them.

Having received the golden earrings, Aaron molds them into a calf and proclaims: Οὗτοι οἱ θεοί σου, Ἰσραήλ, οἵτινες ἀνεβίβασάν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (“These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you out of Egypt”).⁴⁸ In Aaron’s proclamation, Moses is no longer associated with the exodus from Egypt; only the gods represented by this newly manufactured molten object are. More significant than the syncretistic nature of the “Feast to the LORD” that follows in vv. 5–6 is that Aaron’s actions (ᾠκοδόμησεν θυσιαστήριον ... καὶ ... ἀνεβίβασεν ὀλοκαυτώματα, καὶ ... θυσίαν σωτηρίου [“he built an

⁴⁷ Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 518) notes that “The tradition ... shows the influence of v.2 on the text of v.3 where αὐτῶν becomes τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων in the C tradition and is τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτῶν in the majority A text.”

⁴⁸ For the translational difficulties surrounding MT Exod 32:4a, see Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 555–56. On the attribution of the proclamation of Exod 34:4b to Aaron in the LXX, rather than to the people, as in the MT, cf. n. 45.

altar ... and ... presented whole burnt offerings, and .. a sacrifice of deliverance”]) and those of the people (φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν [“to eat and drink”]) recall Exod 24:4–5, 11 (cf. p. 228 above) and suggest another covenant ceremony, thus confirming the abrogation of, or at least intent to abrogate, the previous one.

In Exod 32:7–14, the scene shifts suddenly from cultic revelry in the camp to crisis intercession on the mountain. The LORD informs Moses that the people οὗς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (“whom *you* [Moses] *led* from the land of Egypt”) have transgressed the covenant through idolatrous calf creation and worship, even quoting Aaron’s proclamation verbatim (cf. vv. 4b, 9). “Enraged with anger” (θυμωθεὶς ὀργῇ) at the people, the LORD requests permission to “obliterate” (ἐκτρίβω) them and make Moses into great nation (v. 10). Rather than granting the permission, Moses employs three arguments in vv. 11–13 to intercede for the people.⁴⁹ First, he reminds the LORD of his covenantal relationship, referring to λαόν σου, οὗς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (“*your* people, whom *you* [the LORD] *led* from the land of Egypt”). Second, he appeals to the LORD’s reputation, noting that annihilating the people would allow the Egyptians to conclude that the LORD had brought Israel out with wicked intent. Third, he recalls the LORD’s covenantal commitment to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the form of promises of Seed and Land. In between the second and third arguments, Moses makes this plea: παῦσαι τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θυμοῦ σου, καὶ ἴλεως γενοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου (“Cease your enraged anger, and be propitious toward the evil of *your* people”; v. 12b). Verse 14 recounts the outcome of Moses’ intercession: καὶ ἰλάσθη κύριος περὶ τῆς κακίας ἧς εἶπεν

⁴⁹ So Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 568.

ποιῆσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (“And the LORD was propitiated concerning the evil that he said he would do to his people”).⁵⁰

It is important to recognize that Moses’ intercession is presented as only *partially* successful. The LORD is not propitiated concerning the evil of his people, as Moses requested, but rather concerning the evil “*that he [the LORD] said he would do to his people.*”⁵¹ The very partiality of the success proves hermeneutically significant. Positively, the crisis of immediate destruction has been averted, suggesting that the appeal to the LORD’s reputation has proven effective. This also provides a glimmer of hope that Israel’s covenant breach may not be irreparable. Yet, negatively, the LORD still needs to be propitiated concerning the evil of the people, a fact that forecasts the punitive consequences to follow and need for further intercession.

Before Moses engages in such intercession, however, he must see for himself what Israel has done as well as put a stop to it. And so in Exod 32:15–18 Moses turns and descends the mountain with Joshua in tow. What is most important about this passage, for our purposes, is the emphasis in vv. 15–16 on the two covenant tablets carried by Moses, “tablets of testimony” inscribed by God himself. The premium placed on these tablets underscores the symbolic import of what happens next. Upon arriving at the camp and seeing the calf and choral dancing, Moses becomes “enraged with anger” (ὀργισθεὶς θυμῷ) and “obliterates” (συντρίβω) the tablets. The parallel portrayal of enraged anger

⁵⁰ On the verb ἱλάσκομαι and its cognates, cf. n. 33.

⁵¹ The partial success of Moses’ first intercession is true of the MT as well. Thus Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories,” 56, italics hers) goes too far in saying that Moses “has not asked for ... forgiveness,” though she is correct in stressing the effect of Moses’ initial intercession: “God renounces his plan of *immediate and total* destruction of the Israelites.”

and obliteration in vv. 10 and 19 suggests that Moses, having earlier represented the people to the LORD, now in turn represents the LORD to the people. And the message that he sends by smashing the tablets is covenant breach.⁵²

That message, however, is not final and Moses' subsequent actions, even if ultimately drastic, pave the way for reparation. Thus he destroys the offending calf, confronts Aaron, and then employs volunteers to slaughter three thousand of Aaron's co-conspirators, resulting in blessing for the Levites (Exod 32:20–29).⁵³ Although the treatment of Aaron is far less severe than his co-conspirators, the condemnation of Aaron is implicit in the wording of his response to Moses, especially in the movement from verbatim reproduction of the people's demand (cf. vv. 1b, 23), to accurate paraphrase of his request (cf. vv. 2, 24a), but then to outright misrepresentation of Aaron's own involvement in making the calf (cf. vv. 4a, 24b).

On the next day, Moses returns to his role as representative of the people. The content of the second intercession on the mountain is communicated in two parts. In the first (Exod 32:30–35), the language of “sin” (ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτία), initially used when

⁵² As Moshe Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991], 410) observes, “‘Breaking a tablet’ in the ancient Near Eastern tradition connoted cancellation of the validity of a document.... The violation of the commandments, validated by the covenant, made the covenantal document void, and the breaking of the tablet-document was the proper sign for it.” *Barn.* 4.6–8; 14.1–4a goes so far as to interpret the breaking of the tablets as a sign that Israel permanently lost the covenant and was not worthy to receive it. James N. Rhodes (*The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident* [WUNT 2/188; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], V–VI), however, has recently argued that Barnabas' statements regarding the golden calf incident are “intentionally hyperbolic” and that this incident, for Barnabas, represents “Israel's paradigmatic failure,” whereas the rejection of Jesus and destruction of Jerusalem symbolize Israel's culminating failure and final abandonment by God respectively.

⁵³ Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories,” 60) makes the interesting suggestion that “the Levite episode is not simply a punishment inflicted upon the guilty, as is widely assumed,” but is rather “a desperate—and apparently successful—effort by Moses at crowd control.”

Moses confronted Aaron (32:21), appears repeatedly.⁵⁴ Moreover, this part continues the previous intercession in two respects. First, in accordance with the only *partial* success of Moses' earlier intercession, the LORD still needs propitiation for the ἁμαρτία ("sin"), or κακία ("evil"), of the people. Second, by pleading, ἐξάλειψόν με ἐκ τῆς βίβλου σου ("erase me from your book"; v. 32), if the LORD will not forgive the sin of the people, Moses builds upon his previous intercession. As Christine E. Hayes observes, "Moses' words here are a masterful inversion of God's own proposal to destroy the Israelites and save Moses" alone.⁵⁵ Masterful though his words may be, Moses' strategy proves unsuccessful. The LORD responds that anyone who has sinned will be erased from his book and then, following a charge that sets the stage for part two, the LORD promises to punish the people for their sin, a promise that finds "immediate *narrative* fulfillment" in the plague of v. 35.⁵⁶

Part two of the second intercession (Exod 33:1–6) expands upon part one (32:30–35) and, at the same time, further recalls the initial intercession (32:7–14). In recalling the initial intercession, on the one hand, we discover that Moses' argument concerning the Seed and Land promises had proven effective (cf. 32:13; 33:1b); on the other hand, the reference to λαός σου, οὓς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ("your [Moses'] people, whom *you* [Moses] *led* from the land of Egypt") shows that the damage done to the covenantal relationship still persists (cf. 32:7, 11; 33:1a). Thus Moses is charged to lead *his* people

⁵⁴ ἁμαρτάνω: 32:30, 31, 33; ἁμαρτία: 32:30[2x], 31, 32, 34.

⁵⁵ "Golden Calf Stories," 61.

⁵⁶ Hayes, "Golden Calf Stories," 61, italics hers.

into the Land, even if he has the assurance of an angel going before him (32:34; 33:2–3a).

Yet, expanding upon the role of the angel, it becomes clear that the angel’s presence now entails the LORD’s absence.⁵⁷ The LORD cannot accompany the people because they are “stiff-necked” (σκληροτράχηλος) and, as a consequence, he is liable to “annihilate” (ἐξαναλίσκω) them along the way (33:3b). If part one of the second intercession includes punishment of the people for their specific sin of calf creation and adoration (32:35), part two includes the threat of further punishment for the people’s “stiff-necked” condition (33:5b).⁵⁸ Finally, part two concludes with the LORD commanding the people to acknowledge symbolically their “stiff-necked” condition, a command with which they comply:

Table 23. Command and Compliance in Exod 33:5c–6

^{5c} νῦν οὖν ἀφέλεσθε τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τὸν κόσμον, καὶ δείξω σοι ἃ ποιήσω σοι.	^{5c} Now, then, take away your robes of glory and ornamentation, and I will show you what I will do to you.
⁶ καὶ περιεΐλαντο οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὸν κόσμον αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν περιστολὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ Χωρήβ.	⁶ And the sons of Israel took off their ornamentation and apparel from the mount of Horeb.

Through a key shared expression (καὶ περιΐλαντο [“and they took off”] in 32:3; 33:6), similar or associated vocabulary,⁵⁹ and the same structure (command–compliance),

⁵⁷ This is in contrast to Exod 23:20–23, where the angel appears to be a symbol of divine presence.

⁵⁸ Note the lexical parallels between the appeal to the LORD’s reputation in Exod 32:12a and 33:3–5: ἐξαναλίσκω (32:12aβ; 33:3, 5); πονηρία/πονηρός (32:12aα; 33:4).

⁵⁹ αἰρέω-root in 32:2, 3; 33:5, 6 (cf. also 32:24); ἐνώπιον in 32:2, 3 and κόσμος in 33:5, 6; χρυσοῦς in 32:2, 3 and δόξα in 33:5. On the association of κόσμος and ἐνώπιον, see Isa 3:20; Jdt 10:4; Philo, *Congr.* 113; *Migr.* 97; *Post.* 166. As for the association of χρυσοῦς and δόξα, including their cognates, see 1 Macc 2:18; 6:1; 10:60; 15:32; Ps 45(44):14; Job 37:22; Dan 11:38; 1 Pet 1:7; *T. Job* 32.4, 9; *Let. Aris.* 96, 98; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.254; *J.W.* 6.264; Philo, *Leg.* 2.107; *Det.* 157; *Fug.* 16, 25; *Mut.* 93; *Somn.* 2.55, 57, 61, 62; *Ios.* 150; *Decal.* 4, 71; *Spec.* 4.74; *Flacc.* 30.

Exod 33:5–6 recalls 32:2–3 (cf. p. 229), by way of antithetic parallelism.⁶⁰ The latter text recounts the people’s *disobedience* in complying with Aaron’s command to take off their *earrings* so that he could manufacture a *golden* calf to represent the *acquisition* of *illegitimate* divine presence in the Land. The former text, in contrast, recounts the people’s *obedience* in complying with the LORD’s command to take off their *glorious* apparel and remaining *jewelry* to represent the *loss* of *legitimate* divine presence in the Land.⁶¹ As we shall see, Ps 106(105):19–20 picks up on this inglorious change, or exchange, and, in turn, influences Paul’s argumentation.

The rest of the golden calf account in Exodus is about recapturing the glory of divine presence through covenant restoration. The first step in this direction is a third intercession (Exod 33:7–34:3). This time, however, the intercession takes place in Moses’ tent, not on the mountain. With eight different references to Moses’ “tent” (σκηνή) in Exod 33:7–11,⁶² this setting is clear. Moreover, continuing the theme of divine absence, introduced in the preceding section, we are repeatedly told that the tent in which Moses and the LORD converse is “outside of,” even “far from,” the Israelite camp.⁶³ Yet, even if the location of the tent *outside of the camp* reflects divine absence, the “pillar of the

⁶⁰ Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories,” 63) follows Ralph E. Hendrix (“A Literary Structural Analysis of the Golden-Calf Episode in Exodus 32:1–33:6,” *AUSS* 28 [1990]: 211–17[212–13]) in recognizing this antithetical relationship by labeling Exod 32:1–6, “People act, and Aaron (YHWH’s High Priest) reacts,” and placing it in chiasmic parallel with 33:4–6, “God acts and People react.”

⁶¹ Similarly, Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories,” 61) comments on the “ironic reversal” that has taken place since the people’s desire for divine presence, even if illicit (Exod 32:1), led to divine absence via angelic substitution (cf. 32:34; 33:3–5).

⁶² The term σκηνή appears eleven times (Exod 33:7[3x], 8[3x], 9[2x], 10[2x], 11), but three of these (33:8, 10[2x]) refer to the tents of individual Israelites.

⁶³ ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς: 33:7[2x], 8; μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς παρεμβολῆς: 33:7; and the location outside of the camp is also implicit in this statement about Moses leaving the tent: καὶ ἀπελύετο εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.

cloud,” which descends upon the tent when Moses speaks with the LORD (33:9, 10), symbolizes proximate divine presence (cf. Exod 13:21, 22; 14:19, 24; 19:9); presence close enough to be beheld by individual Israelites *from the camp*.⁶⁴

The portrayal of these Israelites, in fact, prepares for the return of the divine presence to the camp. There is narrative movement from an initial depiction of “everyone who sought the LORD” going out to the tent (v. 7b) to a final depiction of “all the people,” at the sight of the pillar of the cloud, “worshiping” (προσκυνέω), each from the door of his or her own tent (v. 10). This worship contrasts favorably with Israel’s earlier calf adoration (cf. Exod 32:8). Moreover, compared to the preceding description of the people as “stiff-necked” (σκληροτράχηλος) and thus liable to “annihilation” (ἐξαναλίσκω) if accompanied by the LORD (Exod 33:3b, 5a), the transformation into a worshipping community is what allows for the LORD’s return.⁶⁵

The tripartite intercessory conversation of Exod 33:12–34:3 concerns that return and the covenant restoration it entails. In the first part (33:12–17), Moses skillfully mortgages his own special status “above all” (παρὰ παντα/ς: 33:12c, 16c, 17c) and divine “favor” (χάρις: 33:12c, 13[2x], 16a, 17c) to win a pledge of the LORD’s return, or accompaniment, first for himself and then for the people. Beginning with a citation of the LORD’s command that he should lead the people into the Land (cf. 33:1a, 12),⁶⁶ Moses claims: σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἐδήλωσάς μοι ὅν συναποστελεῖς μετ’ ἐμοῦ (“But you have not made

⁶⁴ Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 593.

⁶⁵ Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 592–93.

⁶⁶ The connection between Exod 33:1a, 12 is clearer in the MT, which uses the same verb for the command (נָלַץ), as opposed to the LXX, which uses two different verbs (ἀναβαίνω, ἀνάγω).

clear to *me* whom you will send with *me*"; 33:12b). Given that the LORD had said, συναποστελῶ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρότερόν σου ("I will send my angel before *you*; 33:2a), Moses' claim is best viewed as a clever hermeneutical maneuver. He apparently regards the "*you*" in the promise to send an accompanying angel as a collective reference to the people, which allows him to ask, in essence, "Yet, whom will you send with *me*?"⁶⁷ It is at this point that Moses invokes (a) his own special status and (b) divine favor, stating in v. 12c, σὺ δέ μοι εἶπας Οἶδά σε παρὰ πάντας, καὶ χάριν ἔχεις παρ' ἐμοί ("But you have said to me, 'I know you above all, and you have favor with me'"). Reversing the order, the LORD confirms Moses' (b') divine favor and (a') special status in v. 17c: εὗρηκας γὰρ χάριν ἐνώπιόν μου, καὶ οἶδά σε παρὰ πάντας ("For you have found favor before me, and I know you above all").

In between vv. 12c and 17c, Moses deploys his unique relationship on behalf of the people. That deployment proceeds in two stages (vv. 13–14, 15–17b). First, as validation of his favor, Moses requests a divine theophany so he would know that λαός σου τὸ ἔθνος τοῦτο ("this nation is your people"; v. 13). The LORD implicitly agrees to this theophany by responding to the issue raised in 33:12b (whom he will send with Moses): Αὐτὸς προπορεύσομαί σου καὶ καταπαύσω σε ("I myself will go before you and give you rest"; v. 14). Second, having won *explicit* assurance of his own accompaniment,

⁶⁷ The LXX addition of μοι in the subsequent phrase σὺ δέ μοι εἶπας, which has no parallel in the MT, supports this interpretation. Other interpretations, however, are possible. Childs (*Book of Exodus*, 594), for example, simply says that Moses' "plea, 'You have not told me whom you will send with me,' does not match too well with the mention of the angel in v. 2." Yet, consistent with the view that I have proposed, Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 547, material in brackets mine) states: "This [plea of Moses] was merely a bargaining ploy, since Moses was not really interested in having God's messenger pointed out to him; he wanted full forgiveness for their idolatrous action in connection with the calf episode...."

Moses affirms its importance (v. 15b) and attempts to include the people as well, by associating them with his divine favor and special status.⁶⁸

Table 24. Mosaic Intercession in Exod 33:16a–c

<i>Divine Favor</i>	^{16a} καὶ πῶς γνωστὸν ἔσται ἀληθῶς ὅτι εὑρηκα χάριν παρὰ σοί, ἐγὼ τε καὶ ὁ λαός σου ,	^{16a} And how will it be truly known that I have found <i>favor</i> with you, both I and your people ,
<i>Accompaniment</i>	^{16b} ἀλλ' ἢ συμπορευομένου σου μεθ' ἡμῶν;	^{16b} unless you <i>go with us</i> ?
<i>Special Status</i>	^{16c} καὶ ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐγὼ τε καὶ ὁ λαός σου παρὰ πάντα ἔθνη, ὅσα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐστίν.	^{16c} And I will be glorified, both I and your people , <i>above all</i> nations, as many as are on the earth.

In response to Moses' carefully crafted question and assertion, the LORD says, Καὶ τοῦτόν σοι τὸν λόγον, ὃν εἶρηκας, ποιήσω ("And this word, which you have spoken, I will do *for you*"; v. 17a–b), providing *implicit* confirmation that the LORD will return to, or accompany, the people as well. In this way, Moses successfully deploys *his* unique relationship on behalf of the people.

Part two (Exod 33:18–23) of the tripartite intercessory conversation returns to the divine theophany of v. 13 and repeats the "glory" (δοξ-) terminology of v. 16c (cf. vv. 18, 19, 22). It also plays upon the idea introduced in v. 11 that Moses was able to speak to the LORD ἐνώπιος ἐνωπίῳ, ὡς εἴ τις λαλήσῃ πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φίλον ("face to face, as if someone was to speak to his own friend").⁶⁹ Apparently, the kind of friendly intimacy appropriate for Moses' tent is out of the question when it comes to seeing the LORD's

⁶⁸ The LXX differs from the MT in regard to Moses' special status. In both Exod 33:12c, 17c, the LXX's παρὰ πάντας reflects a "free rendering" (so Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 547) of the MT's ׀ ׀ ׀. In Exod 33:16c, however, παρὰ πάντα is a translation of ׀ ׀ ׀. Thus in vv. 12c, 16c, 17c there is a lexical link in the LXX that is only partially present in the MT.

⁶⁹ On the manner in which the LXX translation of Exod 33:11 reduces tension in the MT, cf. n. 45.

δόξα (“glory”) on the mountain. Thus, in response to Moses’ appeal, “Show me your own glory,” the LORD says that he will, indeed, cause his “glory” to pass before Moses as he (the LORD) calls out the divine name but that Moses can only see the LORD from behind because no human can see the LORD’s πρόσωπον (“face”) and live (vv. 18–23). “Glory” (δοξ-) and “face” (πρόσωπον) language recur at the end of the golden calf account in Exod 34:29–35, but there the references are to *reflected* divine “glory” and *Moses’* “face.”

Part three (Exod 34:1–3) of the tripartite intercessory conversation consists of instructions that prepare for the restoration of the covenant in the fourth and final intercession on the mountain (Exod 34:4–28). The close relationship between the end of the third intercession and beginning of the fourth is the first indication of a chiastic relationship between these two intercessions. As reflected in the following chart, what the LORD instructs at the end of the third intercession is fulfilled at the beginning of the fourth:

Table 25. Instruction and Fulfillment in Exod 34:1a–b, 2a, 4

^{1a–b} Καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν Λάξευσον σεαυτῷ δύο πλάκας λιθίνας καθὼς καὶ αἱ πρῶται.... ^{2a} καὶ γίνου ἔτοιμος εἰς τὸ πρωί , καὶ ἀναβήσῃ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινά....	^{1a–b} <i>And the LORD said to Moses,</i> “ Chisel for yourself two stone tablets <i>just</i> <i>as</i> also the first ones.... ” ^{2a} And be prepared in the morning , and ascend Mount Sinai.... ”
⁴ καὶ ἐλάξευσεν δύο πλάκας λιθίνας καθάπερ καὶ αἱ πρῶται · καὶ ὀρθρίσας Μωυσῆς τὸ πρωὶ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινά , <i>καθότι συνέταξεν αὐτῷ κύριος....</i>	⁴ And he chiseled two stone tablets <i>even</i> <i>as</i> also the first ones : and rising early in the morning Moses ascended Mount Sinai , <i>just like the LORD ordered him....</i>

Moses’ compliance paves the way for covenant restoration. This is indicated not only in the parallelism between καθὼς **καὶ αἱ πρῶται** (“*just as also the first ones*”; v.

1b) and *καθάπερ καὶ αἱ πρώται* (“even as also the first ones”; v. 4)⁷⁰ but also in the assurance of v. 1c: καὶ γράψω ἐπὶ τῶν πλακῶν τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἦν ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶν ταῖς πρώταις, ἃς συνέτριψας (“And I will write upon the tablets the words, which were on the first tablets, which you obliterated”). This assurance finds fulfillment in the conclusion to the fourth intercession (Exod 34:27–28), even if there is tension regarding who inscribed the tablets (the LORD or Moses).⁷¹

The next indication of a chiastic relationship between the third and fourth intercessions is that Moses receives the requested divine theophany in Exod 34:5–7, as confirmed by references to the LORD’s “name” and “passing by,” even if “glory”-terminology is lacking (cf. 33:18–23). The anticipated proclamation of the divine name turns out not to be unprecedented but recalls Exod 20:4–6.⁷² There is, however, one important difference: Exod 34:6b–7 “reverses judgment and mercy, prioritizing mercy and greatly expanding the exposition of it.”⁷³

⁷⁰ This parallelism is further reflected in a “popular tradition [that] has *καθαπερ* as in v.4 for *καθὼς*,” (so Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 554). The manuscripts associated with this tradition include: 707-767 C'' b 53^(mg)-56'-664 n 85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-343' 527 392 319 424 799.

⁷¹ There is also tension concerning the content of this second set of tablets compared to the first. In spite of statements emphasizing identity, like those found in Exod 34:1b–c, 4, a comparison of the laws enumerated in Exod 20 with those enumerated in Exod 34 reveals significant differences. This problem has long been recognized (see Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 604–9). Focusing on the final form of the text, MacDonald (“Recasting,” 32) notes that “Exod 34.27–28 equates ‘these words’, ‘the words of the covenant’ and ‘the ten commandments’, and seems deliberately to confuse Moses, the writer of the book of the covenant (24.7), and YHWH, the writer of the Ten Commandments (31.18; 34.1).” As we shall see, Exod 34:17–26 repeats laws drawn from the beginning and end of the “Book of the Covenant” (20:22–23:33).

⁷² LXX Exod 34:7, in fact, seems to translate דִּבְרֵי נֶצַח with the doublet δικαιοσύνην διατηρῶν καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος, presumably under the influence of LXX 20:6, which has καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος for דִּבְרֵי נֶצַח. See Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 557.

⁷³ MacDonald, “Recasting,” 31.

Such a display of mercy elicits worship from Moses and a final intercessory prayer, to which the LORD promptly responds. This prayer and its initial response in Exod 34:8–11 both corresponds to 33:12–17, to form the final chiasmic pair between the third and fourth intercessions, and recalls themes from part two of the second intercession in 33:1–6, a text to which 33:12–17 is also related. Thus the interconnection between Moses’ intercessions is especially evident here.

At first, apart from the divine address, Moses’ prayer simply seems to repeat his previous intercession: Εἰ εὗρηκα χάριν ἐνώπιόν σου, συμπορευθήτω ὁ κύριός μου μεθ’ ἡμῶν (“If I have found favor before you, let my LORD go with us”; 34:9b).⁷⁴ Yet, as the prayer progresses, we discover that, in light of the LORD’s proclamation of his name, Moses now seeks to address Israel’s “stiff-necked” (σκληροτράχηλος) condition (34:9c). This condition must be addressed and ideally transformed because it threatens the people’s existence once the LORD begins to accompany them again, as *implicitly* promised already (cf. 33:3–4, 17a–b). And so to the LORD who reveals himself as one who ἀφαιρῶν ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας καὶ ἁμαρτίας (“**takes away lawlessness and unrighteousness and sin**” 34:7b), Moses says, ἀφελεῖς σὺ τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐσόμεθα σοί (“**You yourself shall take away our lawlessness and sin**, and we will be yours”; 34:9d).⁷⁵ The prayer that begins with a repetitive request concludes with a confident command, one inspired by the LORD’s merciful name.

⁷⁴ Cf. Exod 33:13a, 16: εἰ οὖν εὗρηκα χάριν ἐναντίον σου ... εὗρηκα χάριν παρὰ σοί, ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ λαός σου, ἀλλ’ ἢ συμπορευομένου σου μεθ’ ἡμῶν;

⁷⁵ There is a closer relationship between vv. 7b and 9d in the LXX than in the MT. The LXX’s τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν of v. 9d transposes the order of the MT (לְעֹנֵנוּ וְלִפְשָׁנוּ), creating an inverse relationship with the terms in v. 7b. More significantly, the LXX’s ἀφαιρέω renders נָשָׂא for v. 7b

The LORD's immediate response, Ἴδου ἐγὼ τίθημί σοι διαθήκην ("Behold, I myself am making a covenant with you"; 34:10b), restores his relationship with Israel. That σοι ("with you") includes the people as a whole, even if directed to Moses, is suggested by what follows next in Exod 34:10c–d:

Table 26. Exod 34:10c–d

^{10c–d} ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου ποιήσω ἐνδοξα , ἃ οὐ γέγονεν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει · καὶ ὄψεται πᾶς ὁ λαός , ἐν οἷς εἶ σύ, τὰ ἔργα κυρίου ὅτι θαυμαστά ἐστίν, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιήσω σοι.	^{10c–d} Before all of your people , I shall do glorious things , which have not occurred in any land and among any nation ; and all the people , among whom you live, shall see the works of the LORD, because wondrous are the things that I myself shall do for you.
--	--

This text, especially the terms in bold, recalls Exod 33:16c (cf. p. 239) and in so doing confirms the broader chiastic relationship suggested for 33:12–17 and 34:8–11. The end of the latter passage also reverses the LORD's earlier decision to send the angel in his place to drive out the inhabitants of the Land, as the following table shows:

Table 27. Reversal of the LORD's Decision in Exod 33:2; 34:11b

Exod 33:2	Exod 34:11b
² καὶ συναποστελῶ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρότερόν σου, καὶ ἐκβάλει τὸν Ἀμορραῖον καὶ Χετταῖον καὶ Φερεζαῖον καὶ Γεργεσαῖον καὶ Εὐαῖον καὶ Ἰεβουσαῖον.	^{11b} ἴδου ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω ἀπὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν τὸν Ἀμορραῖον καὶ Χαναναῖον καὶ Χετταῖον καὶ Φερεζαῖον καὶ Εὐαῖον καὶ Γεργεσαῖον καὶ Ἰεβουσαῖον·
² I will send my angel before you, and <i>he will drive out</i> the Amorites and Hittites and	^{11b} Behold, <i>I myself will drive out</i> from your presence the Amorites and Canaanites

but תָּלַד for v. 9d. While ἀφαιρέω renders נָשַׁב elsewhere (Gen 40:19; Lev 10:17; Num 14:18; Job 24:10), this is the only time that ἀφαιρέω translates תָּלַד. The result of this unprecedented lexical equivalence is arguably a change in meaning: whereas in the MT Moses asks for forgiveness, in the LXX he asks for transformation (i.e. removal of Israel's sinful condition). Other translations of תָּלַד include: ἀφίημι: 14x (Lev 4:26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; 19:22; Num 14:19; 15:25, 26; Isa 55:7); καθαρίζω: 3x (Num 30:6, 9, 13); εἰμι ὡς: 15x (Num 14:20; 1 Kgs 8:30, 34, 36, 39, 50; 2 Chr 6:21, 25, 27, 39; 7:14; Jer 5:1; 31[38]:34; 36[43]:3; 50[27]:20); γίνομαι ὡς: 2x (Jer 5:7; Amos 7:2); ἰλάσκομαι: 6x (2 Kgs 5:18[2x]; 24:4; 2 Chr 6:30; Ps 25[24]:11; Lam 3:42); εὐλατεύω: 2x (Deut 29:20; Ps 103[102]:3); ἰλατεύω: 1x (Dan 9:19 [Theodotion: ἰλάσκομαι]); ἐπιεικής: 1x (Ps 86[85]:5); οὐ μὴ μμνήσκομαι: 1x (Jer 33[40]:8); untranslated: 1x (Num 15:28).

Perizzites and Gergashites and Hivites and Jebusites.	and Hittites and Perizzites and Hivites and Gergashites and Jebusites.
---	--

Thus, as an initial response to Moses' prayer, the LORD in Exod 34:10–11 *explicitly* restores the covenant and his accompanying presence, pledging to clear the way for Israel in the Land. What is not addressed, however, is the transformation of Israel's "stiff-necked" condition. Although the LORD's response thus far may be taken as *implicitly* assenting to such transformation, the Israelites' subsequent history, especially as recounted in Deut 9–10, suggests otherwise. This ambiguity in the Exodus text, particularly when placed within its larger context in the Pentateuch, provides the grounds for interpretive disagreement, as I shall suggest in chapter six.

The rest of the fourth intercession underscores the restoration of the covenant. The phrase μήποτε θῆς διαθήκην τοῖς ἐγκαθημένοις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆςJ ("lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the Land") recurs in vv. 12, 15 and serves as an *inclusio* for a section (Exod 34:12–16) concerning the need for fidelity to Israel's exclusive covenant with the LORD. The following section (34:17–26) consists of a series of laws. Verse 17, καὶ θεοὺς χωνευτοὺς οὐ ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ ("And molten gods you shall not make for yourself"), recalls Exod 20:23, the first commandment of the Book of the Covenant (20:22–23:33), which, as we have seen, was violated in the creation of the calf (cf. 32:1–4 and pp. 228ff. above). Here, however, the purpose of recalling the commandment is not censure but reassurance. This reassuring purpose emerges from the recognition that vv. 18–26, in turn, recall Exod 23:12–19,⁷⁶ commandments toward the

⁷⁶ The relationship between these two series of laws is sometimes verbatim repetition. Cf. esp. Exod 23:17, 19; 34:34:23, 26. Cf. also Exod 13:12–13; 34:19–20.

end of the Book of the Covenant, thereby encompassing the entire code. “Thus,” as Nathan MacDonald observes, “the covenant regulations in ch. 34 are to be seen as a summary of the earlier covenant and not a new law.”⁷⁷ The fourth intercession concludes with a command for Moses to record these regulations and a notice about his forty days and nights of fasting as the new tablets were inscribed (34:27–28).⁷⁸

Moses then descends the mountain with the two tablets, unaware that the skin of his face has been glorified as result of the Sinai experience, a sight that scares Aaron and the other leaders of Israel (Exod 34:39–31). Afterwards, Moses mediates the renewed covenant to the Israelites and also makes a practice of wearing a veil on his glorified face, except when he converses with the LORD and communicates the content of those conversations to Israel (34:32–32). However one interprets this difficult text about the veil,⁷⁹ it is clear that Israel’s covenantal relationship with the LORD has now been fully restored, thanks to the repeated and interrelated intercession of Moses.

Exegesis of Deuteronomy 9–10. The interrelated but nonetheless separate intercessions of Moses in Exod 32–34 are integrated into a single intercessory act in Deut 9–10. This single intercessory act is recounted in three parts (9:18–20; 9:25–10:2; 10:10),⁸⁰ with a related interlude in between each part (9:21–24; 10:3–9; 10:11). To

⁷⁷ “Recasting,” 32.

⁷⁸ On the tension regarding who inscribed the tablets and what was written on them, cf. n. 71.

⁷⁹ Cf. 2 Cor 3:7–18. See especially Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel*; idem, “Paul’s Argument from the Old Testament and Christology in 2 Cor 1–9,” in *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer; BETL 125; Leuven: Leuven University, 1996), 277–303[287–303].

⁸⁰ So also Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy 1–11*, 428), although he limits the second intercession to 9:25–29.

understand the account of the calf in Deut 9–10 properly, one must keep in mind its secondary character and rhetorical context. Besides the manner in which Moses' separate intercessions have been combined into a single intercessory act, the secondary character of Deut 9–10 is especially evident in 9:20, which refers to the LORD's destructive rage against Aaron even though Aaron's role in making the calf is mentioned only in the version of the incident in Exodus.⁸¹ Deut 9–10 thus presupposes Exod 32–34,⁸² if not other chapters of Exodus as well. The secondary character of Deut 9–10 allows for a selective, highly stylized, and non-chronological retelling of the golden calf incident,⁸³ one that is shaped, as we shall see, according to its rhetorical context: a cautionary comparison of Gentile ἀσέβεια ("impiety"; 9:4, 5) and Jewish ἀσέβημα ("impious conduct"; 9:27).⁸⁴ In order to facilitate understanding of how this cautionary comparison unfolds, it will be helpful to outline Deut 9–10. The structure of these chapters may be understood as follows:

⁸¹ So Moshe A. Zipor, "The Deuteronomistic Account of the Golden Calf and Its Reverberation in Other Parts of the Book of Deuteronomy," *ZAW* 108 (1996): 20–33[22, n. 6]; Hayes, "Golden Calf Stories," 86, n. 78.

⁸² The account in Deut 9–10 even attempts to resolve exegetical problems or ambiguities in the Exodus version. Thus, for instance, the LORD's destructive rage against Aaron is mentioned to make explicit what is only implicit in Exod 32:22–24: that Aaron was culpable for his role in creating the calf. For other instances, see Hayes ("Golden Calf Stories," 80–86), who, throughout her essay, argues convincingly against the minority viewpoint that MT Exod 32–34 depends on MT Deut 9–10.

⁸³ Thus S. R. Driver (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* [ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916], 116) errs by attempting to engage in a chronological comparison of Deut 9:25–29 in relation to Exod 32:11–13; 34:9. The non-chronological nature of Deut 9–10 is recognized by Eep Talstra, "Deuteronomy 9 and 10: Synchronic and Diachronic Observations," in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis* (Johannes C. De Moor; *OtSt* d. 34; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 187–210[204]; Hayes, "Golden Calf Stories," 78.

⁸⁴ On the broader rhetorical context, namely an antithetical correspondence between Deut 4:11–13; 5:2–22 and 9:7–10:11, see Robert H. O'Connell, "Deuteronomy IX 7-X 7, 10–11: Panelled Structure, Double Rehearsal and the Rhetoric of Covenant Rebuke," *VT* 42 (1992): 492–509.

- I. Israel's Inheritance and Destruction of the Impious Gentiles (9:1–6)
- II. Israel's Near Destruction for Her Impious Act: The Golden Calf
Incident at Horeb as Paradigmatic Provocation (9:7–10:11)
 - A. Introduction (9:7)
 - B. First Forty Days and Nights: Covenant Rupture (9:8–17)
 - 1. Reception of Tablets (9:8–11)
 - 2. Revelation of Calf and Threat of Destruction (9:12–14)
 - 3. Confirmation of Calf and Crushing of Tablets (9:15–17)
 - C. Second Forty Days and Nights: Covenant Restoration (9:18–10:11)
 - 1. Intercession: Threat of Destruction (9:18–20)
 - 2. Interlude: Calf and Other Sins (9:21–24)
 - 3. Intercession: Content and Covenant Preparations (9:25–10:2)
 - 4. Interlude: Restoration and Covenant Custodians (10:3–9)
 - 5. Intercession: End to Threat of Destruction (10:10)
 - 6. Interlude: Inheritance (10:11)
- III. Exhortation (10:12–22)
 - A. Fearing and Serving the LORD (10:12–13)
 - B. Election: Choosing the Patriarchal Seed (10:14–15)
 - C. Hard-Hearts, Stiff-Necks, Divine Impartiality (10:16–19)
 - A.' Fearing and Serving the LORD (10:20)
 - B.' Election: Multiplying the Patriarchal Seed (10:21–22)

As reflected in this outline, the chapters divide into three major sections, the first two of which begin with an imperative (Ἄκουε [“Hear”] and μνήσθητι [“Remember”] respectively in 9:1a, 7a) and conclude with references to patriarchal promise and inheritance (9:5–6; 10:11c–d). The last major section, on the other hand, consists of exhortation related to the preceding cautionary comparison. We begin our analysis with Deut 9:1–6. This text commences with Moses' announcement to Israel that she⁸⁵ is about

⁸⁵ Apart from two exceptions (ὁμεῖς and ὑμῶν of vv. 1, 5 respectively), LXX Deut 9:1–6 follows its MT counterpart in addressing Israel with the collective singular. In the middle of MT and LXX Deut 9:7, the address changes from the singular to the plural, even if at slightly different points. Cf. John

to “inherit” (κληρονομέω) the Land of greater and stronger nations (9:1–2).⁸⁶ Israel need not worry about opposing these nations, however, since the LORD will “go before”⁸⁷ Israel to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) them (9:3).⁸⁸ Yet, lest she get the wrong impression from this act of divine displacement, Moses commands Israel in 9:4:

Table 28. Deut 9:4

<p>⁴ μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ἐν τῷ ἐξαναλῶσαι κύριον τὸν θεόν σου τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα πρὸ προσώπου σου λέγων Διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην μου εἰσήγαγέν με κύριος κληρονομήσαι τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ταύτην· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀσέβειαν τῶν ἐθνῶν τούτων κύριος ἐξολεθρεύσει αὐτοὺς πρὸ προσώπου σου.</p>	<p>⁴ Do not say in your heart, when the LORD your God annihilates these nations in your presence, “[It is] on account of my righteousness that the LORD has brought me to inherit the good Land”; rather [it is] on account of the impiety of these nations that the LORD will destroy them in your presence.</p>
--	---

Deut 9:5 repeats and expands upon the same point. The repetition occurs in 9:5a–b: It is neither on account of Israel’s “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη) nor her holiness of “heart” (καρδία) that she will “inherit” (κληρονομέω) the Land of the Gentile inhabitants whom the LORD will “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω), but it is on account of their “impiety”

William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 157, 161; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 407.

⁸⁶ LXX Deut 9:1 seems to blend the positive use of the adjective form for the comparative in *μεγάλα* with the standard comparative in *ισχυρότερα*. For a different perspective on LXX Deut 9:1, see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, “Renderings of Hebrew Comparative Expressions with *ἰσχυρ* in the Greek Pentateuch,” *BIOSCS* 12 (1979): 27–42[38]; reprinted in idem, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo; AASF B/237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 141–53[150]. On the use of the positive adjective for the comparative, in general, see Maximilian Zerwick, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Unabridged 5th Rev.; trans. Mary Grosvenor; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996), 48[§145].

⁸⁷ The promise in 9:3 that the LORD will “go before” (προπορεύομαι) Israel explains why the theme of who will “go before” Israel, which is so important to the version of the golden calf incident in Exod 32–34 (cf. 32:1, 23, 34; 33:2, 24; cf. also 33:2; 34:11, 24), is omitted from the account in Deut 9:7–10:11.

⁸⁸ The expression *καὶ γνώσῃ σήμερον* frames Deut 9:3–6, although the occurrence of *σήμερον* in 9:6 has no basis in the MT (cf. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 160).

(ἀσέβεια). If 9:5a–b reiterates the negative basis for Israel’s inheritance (not Israelite righteousness but Gentile impiety), then 9:5c expands upon the positive basis: ἵνα στήσῃ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ὤμοσεν κύριος τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τῷ Ἰακώβ (“in order to uphold the covenant, which the LORD swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob”).

Deut 9:6 seems, at first, simply to repeat the negative basis for a third time, οὐ διὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου... (“[It is] not on account of your righteousness...”), but then in the second member of the clause, rather than emphasizing Gentile impiety yet again, the focus stays on Israel as Moses charges her with being “stiff-necked” (σκληροτράχηλος). This charge recalls the description of the people in Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9 and prepares for the retelling of the golden calf incident that follows in Deut 9:7–10:11. Significantly, the term ἐξολεθρεύω (“destroy”), having appeared three times already in reference to the Gentile inhabitants of the Land (9:3, 4, 5), recurs throughout the retelling (9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10).⁸⁹ This time, however, it refers to Israel’s near-destruction, the basis for which is provided in Deut 9:27, the pivotal point, as we shall see, in Moses’ tripartite intercession (9:18–20; 9:25–10:2; 10:10) and also in relation to the exhortation that follows (10:12–22).

The retelling of the golden calf incident (9:7–10:11) begins in Deut 9:7 with a reminder of Israel’s persistent provocation and disobedience throughout her wilderness

⁸⁹ In Deut 9:3, 8, 14, 19, 20, 25 ἐξολεθρεύω translates שׁמַד, but the hiphil forms of יִרַשׁ and שׁחַת in 9:4, 5 and 9:26; 10:10 respectively. An untranslated hiphil of יִרַשׁ occurs in 9:3, while its qal form appears in 9:1, 4, 5, 6, 23; 10:11, rendered each time by κληρονομέω. The piel of שׁחַת occurs in 9:12 and is translated by ἀνομέω. The significance of these observations is that the motif of “destruction,” tied to ἐξολεθρεύω in the LXX, is not quite as prominent in the MT, though still present.

wanderings, one that prepares for the later incorporation of other incidents, besides the golden calf, in 9:22–24.⁹⁰ The provocation at Horeb, however, proves to be paradigmatic because it nearly resulted in Israel’s destruction, a point initially emphasized as Deut 9:8–11 sets the scene for this incident. The phrase τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας· ἄρτον οὐκ ἔφαγον καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἔπιον (“forty days and forty nights: bread I did not eat and water I did not drink”; 9:9b), agrees in temporal extent with Exod 24:18 (about Moses’ first stay on Sinai) and Exod 34:28 (about Moses’ final stay on Sinai), except that the additional detail about neither eating nor drinking is found only in the latter text. The application of this added detail here allows for a greater parallelism with Moses’ subsequent intercession. Besides emphasizing the temporal extent of Moses’ first stay on Horeb (cf. also 9:11a), Deut 9:8–11 focuses on his reception of the divinely inscribed covenant tablets, as reflected, for example, in the repeated statement: ἔδωκεν κύριος ἐμοὶ τὰς δύο πλάκας τὰς λιθίνας (“The LORD gave me the two stone tablets”; 9:10a, 11b).

The sudden revelation to Moses of Israel’s creation of the calf and the threat of destruction occurs in the form of double-speech in Deut 9:12–14. The disclosure of calf creation in 9:12 essentially matches Exod 32:7b–8b, except that χώνευμα (“molten image”) is substituted in place of μόσχος (“calf”). Yet, the substitution is of little significance, as the latter term appears in 9:21.⁹¹ With 9:13–14, however, matters are

⁹⁰ Cf. esp. 9:7 (ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας ἐξήλθετε ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ... ἀπειθοῦντες διετελεῖτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον) and 9:24 (ἀπειθοῦντες ἦτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἐγνώσθη ὑμῖν). The relationship is even closer in the MT. See Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 170.

⁹¹ Cf. also the reference to μόσχον χωνευτόν in Exod 32:4.

more complicated. Apart from one exception, Deut 9:13 agrees with MT Exod 32:9, a verse omitted from its LXX counterpart.⁹² The exception is the phrase Λελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δις (“I have spoken to you once, even twice”), for which there is no basis either in MT Deut 9:13 or MT Exod 32:9. Given that in Deut 9:13c the LORD, in direct speech, describes the people as σκληροτράχηλος (“stiff-necked”), which he had done *twice* before in LXX Exod 33:3, 5 (as opposed to the *three times* that the parallel Hebrew designation קשה־עֵרָק [“stiff-neck”] appears in MT Exod 32:9; 33:3, 5), John William Wevers plausibly suggests that this phrase reflects a knowledge of, and we may add an appeal to, the LXX Exodus account.⁹³ There is, in other words, an intertextual relationship between Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10 in the LXX, which commends reading these two accounts together.

Following the LORD’s request for permission to “destroy” Israel, utilizing the deuteronomic *Leitwort* ἐξολεθρεύω, in Deut 9:14a, similar to Exod 32:10a, we encounter an additional threat in 9:14b: καὶ ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ὑποκάτωθεν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (“and I will erase their name from under heaven”). Although without parallel in Exod 32:10, the verb ἐξαλείφω (“erase”) recalls Exod 32:32, 33 and is the first indication that Deuteronomy rearranges material from Moses’ intercessions in Exodus.⁹⁴ Finally, as a corollary to the threat of destruction, the LORD’s proposal to Moses, καὶ ποιήσω σὲ εἰς ἔθνος μέγα (“and I will make you into a great nation”), which occurs in both Exod 32:10b

⁹² Cf. n. 45.

⁹³ *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 164.

⁹⁴ Cf. O’Connell, “Deuteronomy IX 7–X 7, 10–11,” 505. The verb in the MT is נָחַם.

and Deut 9:14c, is expanded in the latter text to include *καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦτο* (“and strong and more numerous than they”).⁹⁵ This language ironically evokes the description of the Gentile nations in Deut 9:1–2. In the end, then, Deut 9:12–14 proves to be a complex combination of material drawn from, or appealing to, Exodus as well as an expansion specific to Deuteronomy.

Without, at this point, interceding for Israel, a matter to which we shall return, Moses in Deut 9:15 recounts turning and descending the fiery mountain carrying the two tablets in his two hands. What he sees in 9:16b–c confirms what the LORD had seen and revealed to him in 9:12d–e, 13b, as the following chiastic relationship indicates:⁹⁶

παρέβησαν ταχὺ ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ἧς ἐνετείλω αὐτοῖς·
 ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς χώνευμα....
 Ἔώρακα....
 καὶ ἰδὼν ...
 ἐποίησατε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς χωνευτὸν καὶ
 παρέβητε ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ἧς ἐνετείλατο ὑμῖν κύριος....

They have transgressed quickly from the way, which I commanded them:
 they have made for themselves a molten image....
 I have seen....
 And seeing ...
 you have made for yourselves a molten object and
 you have transgressed from the way, which the LORD commanded you....

⁹⁵ Because the positive adjective is used for the comparative, Deut 9:14c could also be translated as: “and I will make you into a nation greater and stronger and more numerous than they.” Cf. n. 86.

⁹⁶ So G. J. Venema, *Reading Scripture in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 9–10; 31 — 2 Kings 22–23 — Jeremiah 36 — Nehemiah 8* (*OtSt* 48; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 17.

Moses then reminds Israel of his response to what he had seen: καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῶν δύο πλακῶν ἔρριψα αὐτάς ἀπὸ τῶν δύο χειρῶν μου καὶ συνέτριψα αὐτάς ἐναντίον ὑμῶν (“And grasping the two tablets, I hurled them from my two hands and crushed them before you”; 9:17). This verse parallels Exod 32:19, except that the reference to Moses’ “enraged anger” (ὀργισθεὶς θυμῷ) has been removed and replaced with details indicative of intention (ἐπιλαβόμενος [“grasping”]) and demonstration (ἐναντίον ὑμῶν [“before you”]). These alterations may have been to guard against the impression that Moses had inadvertently smashed the tablets out of anger.⁹⁷ In any case, Deut 9:17 portrays the crushing of the tablets, and implied cancellation of the covenant, as a calculated act.⁹⁸

It is only after the crushing of the tablets that Moses’ intercession begins in Deut 9:18ff. As noted above, Deuteronomy integrates the interrelated but separate intercessions of Moses from Exodus into a single intercessory act, one that is recounted in three parts (9:18–20; 9:25–10:2; 10:10). Each part of the intercession shares four basic formal features. First, there are spatial (“on the mountain” or “before the LORD”) as well as chronological indications to mark the start, or resumption, of the intercession. These, in turn, create a parallel with Moses’ initial stay on Horeb to receive the tablets, as this table shows:⁹⁹

⁹⁷ See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 410; Hayes, “Golden Calf Stories,” 82.

⁹⁸ On the symbolic import of crushing the covenant tablets, cf. n. 52.

⁹⁹ According to Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy 1–11*, 427), “The recurrence of the expression ‘forty days and forty nights’ points toward the liturgical-intercessory nature of the whole section under discussion.”

Table 29. Deut 9:9c, 18a–b, 25a; 10:10a

9:9c καὶ κατεγινόμην ἐν τῷ ὄρει τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας· ἄρτον οὐκ ἔφαγον καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἔπιον.	9:9c And I occupied myself <u>on the mountain</u> for forty days and forty nights: bread I did not eat and water I did not drink.
9:18a–b καὶ ἐδεήθην ἔναντι κυρίου δεύτερον καθάπερ καὶ τὸ πρότερον τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας· ἄρτον οὐκ ἔφαγον καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἔπιον·	9:18a–b And I prayed before the LORD a second time, just as also the first, for forty days and forty nights: bread I did not eat and water I did not drink.
9:25a καὶ ἐδεήθην ἔναντι κυρίου τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας....	9:25a And I prayed before the LORD for forty days and forty nights....
10:10a καὶ γὰρ ἔστην ἐν τῷ ὄρει τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας....	10:10a And I was <u>on the mountain</u> for forty days and forty nights....

Second, each part of the intercession records the LORD’s response, marked by ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ (“at this time”), or a synonymous expression. Thus, in part one (9:18–22), we are told καὶ εἰσήκουσεν κύριος ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ (“And the LORD heard me also **at that time**”; 9:19c). The subsequent appearance of ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ in reference to Moses’ prayer for Aaron in 9:20b implies that he was heard once again. Similar to and yet expanding upon the first appearance in part one, we read in part three: καὶ εἰσήκουσεν κύριος ἐμοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν κύριος ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ὑμᾶς (“And the LORD heard me also **at that time**, and the LORD did not want to destroy you”; 10:10b). As for part two (9:18–10:2), the pattern established thus far suggests that the synonymous Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (“At that time”) in 10:1a introduces the LORD’s response to Moses’ intercession. Thus the command to chisel new stone tablets like the first ones upon which the LORD will write the same words (10:1b–2) has been displaced from the tent-context of Exod 34:1–3 and associated here with Moses’ intercession on the mountain. An additional detail, the construction of an “ark” (κιβωτός) in which to deposit the covenant tablets has also been added, to which we shall return.

For now we may note that in Deut 10:3–5 Moses recounts in rapid succession: constructing the ark; chiseling the tablets; ascending the mountain to have them inscribed; his reception of the newly-inscribed tablets; descent down the mountain; and finally placement of the covenant tablets in the ark. Deut 10:3–5 thus describes the restoration of the covenant. Yet, in this version of the golden calf incident, as opposed to Exod 32–34, restoration, while crucial, is not the focal point; rather the focal point is the tripartite intercession, which averts Israel’s destruction and enables restoration.

The close relationship between Deut 10:3–5 and the end of the preceding intercession instead illustrates the third feature, already noted above: each part of Moses’ intercession (9:18–20; 9:25–10:2; 10:10) is followed by an associated interlude (9:21–24; 10:3–9; 10:11). In the case of part two (9:25–10:2), the interlude is composed of two subsections. After the flurry of activity in Deut 10:3–5, concluding with newly-inscribed covenant tablets in the ark, Deut 10:6–9 consists of a travel itinerary that recounts Aaron’s death along the way as well as the LORD’s installation of the Levites,¹⁰⁰ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (“at that time”), to carry the κιβωτός (“ark”) of the covenant and minister before the LORD, who himself is the Levites’ κληρος (“allotment” or “inheritance”). Significantly, the references to ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ and the κιβωτός provide links to the LORD’s response in 10:1–2, while κληρος, which occurs twice in 10:9, appears in 9:29, toward the end of Moses’ intercessory words.

The association between part three of the intercession (10:10) and its interlude (10:11) is not terminological but thematic. Since 10:10b indicates that the LORD no

¹⁰⁰ Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories,” 81–82) suggests that the reference to Aaron’s death implies punishment, even if delayed, for his role in the golden calf. Note the discrepancy with Num 33:37–39.

longer wanted to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) Israel, thanks to Moses’ intercession, 10:11 appropriately concludes the account of the calf with what prompted its rehearsal: the command to “enter into” (εἰσπορεύομαι) and “inherit” (κληρονομέω) the Land “sworn” (ὀμνύω) to the patriarchs (cf. 9:5). As for part one (9:18–20) and its interlude (9:21–24), the relationship is once again terminological and thematic. In Deut 9:18c–19b, Moses recounts the subject of his intercession and his reaction to the LORD’s rage:

Table 30. Deut 9:18c–19b

^{18c-d} περὶ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν, ὧν ἡμάρτετε ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ἔναντι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν παροξύναι αὐτόν. ^{19a-b} καὶ ἔκφοβός εἰμι διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ τὸν θυμὸν, ὅτι παρωξύνθη κύριος ἐφ’ ὑμῖν ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ὑμᾶς·	^{18c-d} concerning all of your sins , which you sinned [by] doing evil before the LORD your God [so as] to provoke him. ^{19a-b} And I was terrified on account of the wrath and anger, because the LORD was provoked by you to destroy you.
---	--

The terms in bold reappear in the subsequent, two-part interlude (9:21, 22–24). In 9:21a, Moses describes the calf as **ἁμαρτίαν** ὑμῶν (“your **sin**”). Similarly, in 9:22c Moses refers to **παροξύνοντες** (“**provoking**”) the LORD. Thematically, the disposal of the idol in 9:21 carries the account of the calf forward,¹⁰¹ while the catalogue of wilderness incidents in 9:22–24, including Ἐμπυρισμῶ (“Burn”; cf. Num 11:1–3), Πειρασμῶ (“Test”; cf. Exod 17:1–7), Μνήμασιν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας (“Tombs of Desire”; cf. Num 11:4–35), and disobedience at Καδὴς Βαρνή (“Kadesh Barnea”; cf. Num 13:1–14:45), corroborates the charge that Israel has been disobedient to the LORD since she left Egypt (cf. 9:7, 24). Interestingly, the association of the calf and these wilderness incidents with “all of your sins” in 9:18c suggests that Moses’ intercession encompasses

¹⁰¹ On the relationship of Deut 9:21 to Exod 32:20, see Christopher T. Begg, “The Destruction of the Calf (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21),” in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (Norbert Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: Leuven University, 1985), 208–51.

the entire desert period. This suggestion finds corroboration, as we shall see, in the subsequent parallel between Deut 9:28b and Num 14:16a, words drawn from Moses' prayer at Kadesh Barnea (cf. the chart below).¹⁰²

The fourth feature shared by each of the three parts of Moses' intercession in Deuteronomy is interrelationship. Part one (9:18–20) introduces the intercession and even anticipates its outcome, while part three (10:10) concludes by confirming that outcome: The LORD listened to Moses and no longer wanted to destroy Israel (cf. 9:19c; 10:10b on p. 254 above). In between, part two (9:25–10:2) discloses the content of the intercession. Following the resumption in 9:25–26a and prior to the LORD's response in 10:1–2, Moses' words in 9:26b–29 take center stage. These intercessory words, along with their biblical parallels, are reproduced in the following table:

Table 31. Parallels to Moses' Intercession in Deut 9:26b–29

Deut 9:26b–29	Exod 32:11–13; 34:6, 9; Num 14:16
<p>^{26b} <i>Κύριε κύριε βασιλεῦ τῶν θεῶν,</i></p> <p><i>μὴ ἐξολεθρεύσης τὸν λαόν σου καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, ἣν ἐλυτρώσω ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι σου τῇ μεγάλῃ, οὗς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι σου τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρί σου τῇ κραταίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονί σου τῷ ὑψηλῷ.</i></p> <p>²⁷ <i>μνήσθητι Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ τῶν θεραπόντων σου, οἷς ὥμοσας κατὰ σεαυτοῦ.</i></p> <p><i>μὴ ἐπιβλέψης ἐπὶ τὴν σκληρότητα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τὰ ἀσεβήματα καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν,</i></p>	<p>Exod 34:6b <i>Κύριος κύριος ὁ θεὸς....</i></p> <p>Exod 32:11b–c <i>Ἴνα τί, κύριε, θυμοῖ ὀργῇ εἰς τὸν λαόν σου, οὗς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλῃ καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ;</i></p> <p>Exod 32:13a–b <i>μνησθεὶς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ τῶν σῶν οἰκετῶν, οἷς ὥμοσας κατὰ σεαυτοῦ....</i></p> <p>Exod 34:9c–d <i>ὁ λαὸς γὰρ σκληροτράχηλός ἐστιν, καὶ ἀφελεῖς σὺ τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐσόμεθα σοί.</i></p>

¹⁰² See Talstra, “Deuteronomy 9 and 10,” 205.

<p>²⁸ <i>μὴ εἰπωσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν, ὅθεν ἐξήγαγες ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖθεν, λέγοντες</i></p> <p>Παρά τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι κύριον εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,</p> <p><i>καὶ παρὰ τὸ μισῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.</i></p> <p>²⁹ <i>καὶ οὗτοι λαός σου καὶ κληρὸς σου, οὓς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι σου τῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονί σου τῷ ὑψηλῷ.</i></p>	<p>Exod 32:12a <i>μήποτε εἰπωσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι λέγοντες....</i></p> <p>Num 14:16a Παρά τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι κύριον εἰσαγαγεῖν τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ὤμοσεν αὐτοῖς....</p> <p>Exod 32:12b <i>Μετὰ πονηρίας ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν....</i></p> <p>Exod 32:11b-c <i>Ἵνα τί, κύριε, θυμοὶ ὀργῇ εἰς τὸν λαόν σου, οὓς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλῃ καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ;</i></p>
<p>^{26b} <i>O LORD, LORD, king of the gods,</i></p> <p><i>do not destroy your people and your inheritance, whom you redeemed by your great might, whom you led out of the land of Egypt by your great might and powerful hand and by your exalted arm.</i></p> <p>²⁷ <i>remember Abraham and Isaac and Jacob your servants, to whom you swore by yourself:</i></p> <p><i>Do not look upon the <i>stiffness</i> of this people and their impious acts and <i>sinful conduct</i>,</i></p> <p>²⁸ <i>lest those inhabiting the land, out of which you led us, say, stating</i></p> <p>Because the LORD was unable to lead them into the Land, which he mentioned to them,</p> <p><i>and because he hated them he led them out to kill them in the desert.</i></p> <p>²⁹ <i>and these are your people and your lot, whom you led out of the land of Egypt by your great might and by your exalted arm.</i></p>	<p>Exod 34:6b <i>The LORD, the LORD God....</i></p> <p>Exod 32:11b-c <i>Why, O LORD, are you enraged with wrath at your people, whom you led out of the land of Egypt by great might and by exalted arm?</i></p> <p>Exod 32:13a-b <i>remembering Abraham and Isaac and Jacob your slaves, to whom you swore by yourself....</i></p> <p>Exod 34:9c-d <i>For your people are <i>stiff-necked</i>, and you shall take away our <i>sin</i> and lawlessness, and we will be for you.</i></p> <p>Exod 32:12a <i>Unless the Egyptians say, stating....</i></p> <p>Num 14:16a Because the LORD was unable to lead this people into the Land, which he swore to them....</p> <p>Exod 32:12b <i>With evil intent he led them out to kill them in the mountains....</i></p> <p>Exod 32:11b-c <i>Why, O LORD, are you enraged with wrath at your people, whom you led out of the land of Egypt by great might and by exalted arm?</i></p>

Analysis of these intercessory words and their biblical parallels shows that, with modifications and one partial exception, Moses employs the same three arguments in Deut 9:26b–29 as in Exod 32:11–13 (cf. p. 231 above).¹⁰³ The argument concerning covenantal relationship frames the intercession (Deut 9:26b–c, 29; cf. Exod 32:11b–c), while the appeal to the LORD’s reputation (Deut 9:28; cf. Exod 32:12a–b) includes an insertion of the same appeal drawn from Num 14:16a. The partial exception concerns the LORD’s covenantal commitment to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Although Deut 9:27a refers to the oath sworn to these patriarchs,¹⁰⁴ there is no mention of the Seed and Land promises that form the content of that oath in Exod 32:13. Intriguingly, however, the Land promise of Exod 32:13d appears at the end of the interlude for part three (Deut 10:11c), while the Seed promise of Exod 32:13c, as documented below, occurs at the end of the exhortation related to the golden calf incident (Deut 10:22b).

Analysis of the intercessory words that remain in Deut 9:26b, 27b suggests that, even if not to the same degree as Exod 32:11–13, they reflect the influence of Exod 34:6–9. The address of Deut 9:26b may have been fashioned as a response to the initial revelation of the LORD’s name in Exod 34:6b and the plea of Deut 9:27b shares affinities

¹⁰³ With less qualifications, this is noted by Childs, *Book of Exodus*, 568.

¹⁰⁴ As Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 173) observes, “οἷς ὁμοσας κατὰ σεαυτοῦ” of Deut 9:27a “has no basis in MT, but was lifted word for word from its parallel Exod 32:13, for which MT has *אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעַת לָהֶם בְּךָ*.” Although Hayes (“Golden Calf Stories,” 77), in comparing MT Exod 32:13 to MT Deut 9:27a, attempts to exploit this difference, arguing that the patriarchs in the latter text, as opposed to the former, “are mentioned not to remind God of his obligation, but precisely to underscore the unworthiness of the current generation in contrast to its ancestors,” her claim is debatable. The two other verses in which the patriarchs are mentioned (Deut 9:5; 10:11), include the oath in both the MT and LXX. Thus the addition in the LXX of Deut 9:27a could equally be regarded as an attempt to make explicit what is already implicit in its MT counterpart, by virtue of the surrounding context.

with the prayer of Exod 34:9c–d. Deut 10:21b reinforces these proposed parallels, since this verse, as we shall see, recalls Exod 34:10c–d.

If Deut 9:27b does reflect the influence of Exod 34:9c–d, then it proves all the more significant that the reference to Israel’s ἀσέβημα (“impious conduct”) is redactional. This attribution as well as the verse in which it is embedded are, in fact, the pivot around which the entire deuteronomic account of the calf turns. As we have seen, Deut 9:1–6 introduces the account by warning Israel more than once that her impending inheritance of the Land and the corresponding “destruction” (ἐξολεθρεύω; 9:3, 4, 5) of its Gentile inhabitants are not indications of Israel’s “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη; 9:4, 5, 6) but rather of Gentile “impiety” (ἀσέβεια; 9:4, 5). The account of the calf is then told in Deut 9:7–10:11 to recall a time when Israel was nearly “destroyed” (ἐξολεθρεύω; 9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10). On the one hand, Deut 9:27b, in associating Israel with ἀσέβημα (not unlike Gentile ἀσέβεια), provides the reason that Israel was *nearly* destroyed. On the other hand, the patriarchal promise of Deut 9:27a, since it also appears in Deut 9:5; 10:11, provides the reason, even more so than the other two arguments, that Israel was *not* destroyed.

The two ideas implicit in Deut 9:27, election and divine impartiality, then reappear in 10:12–22, the exhortation that follows the account of the calf. As shown in the outline above (cf. p. 247), this section is bounded by two calls to fear and serve the LORD (10:12–13, 20), each followed by a subsection on election (10:14–15, 21–22). In the middle (10:16–19), we find a subsection united, in the first instance, by its plural

address, as opposed to the singular address of Israel that precedes and follows.¹⁰⁵ This

central subsection begins with exhortation related to the calf account (10:16) and

concludes with an inferentially linked assertion of divine impartiality (10:17–19).

Although the exhortation in 10:16 most transparently recalls 9:7–10:11, the presence of the golden calf permeates 10:12–22, including several parallels to Exod 32–34.

We begin with the affinities to Exod 32–34. As we have seen, associating Israel with his own special status is an important part of Moses’ intercessory strategy in Exod 33:12–17 (cf. pp. 237ff.). We have also seen that this strategy proves successful as the language of the LORD’s response in Exod 34:10c recalls Exod 33:16c (cf. p. 243). It is all the more striking, then, that the two subsections on election in Deut 10:14–15, 21–22 parallel each of these texts respectively.¹⁰⁶

Table 32. Parallels of Exod 33:16c; 34:10c–d in Deut 10:15, 21

Exod 33:16c	Deut 10:15
καὶ ἐνδοξασθῆσόμεθα ἐγὼ τε καὶ ὁ λαός σου παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη , ὅσα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐστίν.	πλὴν τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν προεῖλατο κύριος ἀγαπᾶν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐξελέξατο τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν μετ’ αὐτοὺς ὑμᾶς παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην.
And I will be glorified, both I and your people, above all nations , as many as are on the earth.	Yet the LORD selected your fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, you, above all nations , as to this day.

¹⁰⁵ An exception is the preparatory בָּכַח/ὑμᾶς in 10:15. I owe this insight regarding the plural versus singular address of Israel to Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11*, 440.

¹⁰⁶ The phrase *παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* also occurs in Deut 7:6, 7[2x], 14. Whether these instances reflect an appeal to Exod 33:16c, the larger web of intertextual relations between Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10 suggests that Deut 10:15 does. Corroboration for this proposal may be found in Deut 10:21. As Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 186, material in brackets mine) observes, “The choice of ἐνδοξα ‘glorious’ to render נִרְהָת [a niphal form of רָאָה] ‘fearful’ is highly unusual, occurring elsewhere only at Isa 64:3 where the translation is extremely free....” In Exod 34:10, ἐνδοξα renders a niphal form of רָאָה, while θαυμαστός renders a slightly different niphal form of רָאָה than is found in Deut 10:21. Since the LXX translator had already employed the cognate verb θαυμάζω idiomatically, though accurately, in Deut 10:17, he may have chosen the “highly unusual” rendering of ἐνδοξα for נִרְהָת in Deut 10:21, rather than what would have been a stylistically redundant θαυμαστός, in order to preserve the connection with Exod 34:10.

Exod 34:10c–d	Deut 10:21
ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου ποιήσω ἐνδοξα , ἃ οὐ γέγονεν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει· καὶ ὄψεται πᾶς ὁ λαός, ἐν οἷς εἶ σύ, τὰ ἔργα κυρίου ὅτι θαυμαστά ἐστίν, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιήσω σοι.	αὐτὸς καύχημά σου καὶ αὐτὸς θεός σου, ὅστις ἐποίησεν ἐν σοὶ τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ ἐνδοξα ταῦτα, ἃ εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου.
<i>Before all of your people, I shall do glorious things, which have not occurred in any land and among any nation: and all the people, among whom you live, shall see the works of the LORD, because wondrous are the things that I myself shall do for you.</i>	He is your boast and he is your God, <i>who did among you these great and glorious things, which your eyes have seen.</i>

Furthermore, the second subsection on election (Deut 10:21–22) and thus the entire hortatory section (10:12–22) concludes, as noted above, with the Seed promise of Exod 32:13 that was omitted from Deut 9:27.¹⁰⁷

Table 33. Parallel of Exod 32:13c in Deut 10:22b

Exod 32:13c	Deut 10:22b
Πολυπληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα ὑμῶν ὥσει τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει....	ἐν ἐβδομήκοντα ψυχαῖς κατέβησαν οἱ πατέρες σου εἰς Αἴγυπτον, νυνὶ δὲ ἐποίησέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὥσει τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει.
I will multiply your seed like the stars of the sky in number.	With seventy persons your fathers went down to Egypt, but now the LORD your God has made you like the stars of the sky in number.

Significantly, in all three of these parallels, what is presented as promise in Exodus is regarded as fulfilled in Deuteronomy. The hermeneutical function of this subtle intertextual pattern, then, is to suggest that neither the golden calf incident nor Israel's other wilderness provocations prevented the fulfillment of God's promises. Israel's elect status, in other words, remains secure. Such knowledge, however, should not breed complacency but rather resolve to fear and serve the LORD (Deut 10:12–13, 20).

¹⁰⁷ The phrase ὥσει τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει also occurs in Deut 1:10, while the similar expression ὥσει τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς πλήθος is found in Deut 28:62. Again, even if these texts do not represent appeals to Exod 32:13, the broader context suggests that Deut 10:22 does.

Standing in the way of Israel's service, however, is her own disobedient disposition. Thus Deut 10:16 enjoins: καὶ περιτεμεῖσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν οὐ σκληρυνεῖτε ἔτι (“And you shall circumcise your hard-heart and stiffen your neck no longer”).¹⁰⁸ The σκληρ-root, meaning “stiff” or “hard,” appears twice in this verse and recalls the characterization of Israel as σκληροτράχηλος (“stiff-necked”) in 9:6, which introduced the account of the calf in 9:7–10:11 and was twice given particular prominence in that account. First, in 9:13 the LORD described the people as σκληροτράχηλος in direct speech introduced by the statement Λελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δις (“I have spoken to you once, even twice”), itself likely an allusion to the characterization of Israel as σκληροτράχηλος in LXX Exod 33:3, 5. Second, the pivotal 9:27, in addition to associating Israel with ἀσέβημα (“impious conduct”), also attributed σκληρότης (“hardness”) to her. The exhortation of 10:16 thus suggests that Israel still struggles with the same stiff-necked condition that led to the impious act of the golden calf and the other wilderness provocations (cf. Deut 29:4).

Linked by an inferential particle (γάρ [“for”]), the statement of divine impartiality in Deut 10:17–19 provides the rationale for Israel to circumcise her hard-heart and stiffen her neck no longer. To understand the nature of this rationale, one must note the prominence given to the proselyte. Following the lengthy description of the LORD God as the God of gods, Lord of lords, the great, strong, and fearful one who οὐ θαυμάζει πρόσωπον οὐδὲ μὴ λάβῃ δῶρον (“neither wonders at a person nor takes a bribe”; v. 17),

¹⁰⁸ As Wevers (*Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 183) notes, the LXX's σκληροκαρδία provides a moral interpretation of the MT (עַרְלֹת לִבְבָכֶם), especially in comparison to Aquila's ἀκροβυστίαν (καρδίας).

he is then further described as ποιῶν κρίσιν προσήλυτῳ καὶ ὀρφανῷ καὶ χήρᾳ (“doing justice for the proselyte and for the orphan and for the widow”; v. 18a). These descriptions are related. Since the great, strong, and fearful LORD God does not need to curry favor with the powerful or receive bribes to maintain his position, he is able to act on behalf of the proselyte, widow, and orphan, three groups often associated in Deuteronomy as representing vulnerable members of society. Deut 24:17–21, for example, warns against diverting justice from the proselyte, orphan, and widow and then commands Israelites to leave behind the unharvested remains of their fields, olive trees, and vineyards, citing proselytes, orphans, and widows as beneficiaries three separate times. In contrast, Deut 10:18b–19 ceases mention of the widow or orphan and concentrates on the proselyte:

Table 34. Deut 10:18b–19

^{18b} καὶ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν προσήλυτον δοῦναι αὐτῷ ἄρτον καὶ ἱμάτιον. ¹⁹ καὶ ἀγαπήσετε τὸν προσήλυτον· προσήλυτοι γὰρ ἦτε ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.	^{18b} And he [the LORD] loves the proselyte, to give him food and clothing. ¹⁹ And you shall love the proselyte: for you were proselytes in the land of Egypt.
--	--

Beyond promoting justice, the LORD is here presented as loving the proselyte, love that manifests itself in concrete provision. Israelites, in turn, are commanded to show the same love; for they were proselytes in Egypt. This much is explicit. What is not explicit, however, proves to be more important. Keeping in mind that proselytes are resident aliens, or Gentiles,¹⁰⁹ allows one to discern the coherence of this proselyte-oriented statement of divine impartiality with the broader context of Deut 9–10 and its

¹⁰⁹ On the term προσήλυτος and its Hebrew counterpart גֵּר, see Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, 193; Karl Georg Kuhn, “προσήλυτος,” *TDNT* 6:727–44.

inferential link to 10:16, in particular. It is an inferential link that carries an implicit warning: If Israel does not overcome her own impious inclinations, then she may face the same fate as the Gentile inhabitants of the Land. As we shall see in chapter five, such an understanding of Deut 9–10, especially 9:27; 10:16–17, illuminates Paul’s argumentation in Rom 2:5–11.

Comparison of Moses’ Intercession in Exodus 32–34 and Deuteronomy 9–10.

We turn now to compare briefly Moses’ interrelated but separate intercessions in Exod 32–34 with his single, though tripartite, intercessory act in Deut 9–10. Given the secondary, or dependent, character of the latter on the former, much has already been said in this regard. Here I wish only to note one similarity and two differences that will prove important for understanding the particular conversation about Jewish identity sketched in chapter six. The similarity is that both intercessions result in covenant restoration for Israel, especially as symbolized by the re-inscribed tablets (Exod 34:1–4, 28b; Deut 10:1–5). In fact, even seemingly disparate details find coherence in their contribution to this theme. Thus, whereas Exod 34:17–26 recalls Exod 20:23; 23:12–19 (laws from the beginning and end of the Book of the Covenant) to underscore restoration, Deut 10:1–5 incorporates construction of the ark to the same end in the instructions given to and fulfilled by Moses. Moreover, given that in Exodus the blueprint for the ark and its construction occur in 25:10(9)–22(21) and 37(38):1–9(8) respectively, that is within the book’s larger restorative framework, then the incorporation of the ark in Deut 10:1–5

may even reflect dependence on, or at least awareness of, Exodus chapters beyond those associated with the golden calf account.¹¹⁰

The two differences relate to timing and transformation. We begin with the former. Upon hearing about the creation of the calf and the threat that this sin represented to Israel's existence in Exod 32:7–10, Moses is presented in 32:11–13 as immediately interceding on behalf of the people. This intercession occurs prior to Moses' descent down the mountain and thus prior to his obliteration of the covenant tablets, symbolizing covenant breach. Although Moses' initial intercession is only partially successful, since the LORD is not propitiated concerning the evil of his people, as Moses requested, but rather concerning the evil that he said he would do to the people (32:14), it nonetheless results in the removal of the present threat to Israel's existence and also provides a glimmer of hope, when Moses subsequently smashes the tablets, that Israel's covenant breach may not be irreparable.

In terms of content, Deuteronomy reproduces much of Exod 32:7–13. On the one hand, the LORD's revelation to Moses about Israel's creation of the calf and the danger of destruction in Deut 9:12–14 largely parallels Exod 32:7–10, even if there are some important additions in the former text (e.g. Deut 9:12–14 includes the threat of “erasure” [ἐξάλειψω], likely inspired by Exod 32:32, 33). On the other hand, the content of Moses' intercession in Deut 9:26b–29 employs the same three arguments as in Exod 32:11–13, even if once again there are important additions (e.g. the insertion in Deut 9:28b of language drawn from Num 14:16a). It is the temporal relationship of the Exodus content,

¹¹⁰ If so, then Deut 10:1–5 disregards the detail that in Exod 37(38):1 it was Bezalel, not Moses, who made the ark.

however, that is strikingly different. In Deuteronomy, Moses does not, as in Exodus, immediately intercede for the people upon hearing about the calf and the danger of destruction. Instead, he descends the mountain and smashes the covenant tablets (9:15–17). It is only after this calculated act that Moses’ tripartite deuteronomic intercession begins (9:18ff.). Hermeneutically, this altered temporal relationship magnifies the degree to which calf creation and adoration represented covenant rupture, at the extreme suggesting that, in the brief moment after the tablets had been smashed and before the intercession began, all hope of reparation was lost.

One could, of course, object that the non-chronological nature of the account in Deut 9–10 mitigates this difference regarding the timing of Moses’ intercession. Yet, in response, it could equally be argued that the non-chronological nature of Deut 9–10 actually enhances the difference. The introduction to Moses’ intercession (9:18–20) could easily have been inserted before Moses’ descent down the mountain (9:15). It therefore proves significant that the introduction was instead inserted prior to Moses’ disposal of the calf idol (9:21) and *after* he had smashed the covenant tablets (9:16–17).

The second difference between Moses’ interrelated but separate intercessions in Exod 32–34 and his single, though tripartite, intercessory act in Deut 9–10 concerns the theme of transformation. We noted above that Exod 33:10 portrays the transformation of Israel into a worshiping community compared to her earlier calf adoration (32:8) and the description of the people as “stiff-necked” and thus liable to annihilation (33:3b, 5a). This transformation, in turn, allows for the LORD’s return and the restoration that return symbolizes. We also noted that Moses’ prayer in Exod 34:9 seeks to address and ideally

transform Israel's "stiff-necked" (σκληροτράχηλος) condition. Thus, in response to the LORD who reveals himself as one who **ἀφαιρῶν ἀνομίας καὶ ἀδικίας καὶ ἁμαρτίας** ("takes away lawlessness and unrighteousness and sin" 34:7b), Moses says, **ἀφελεῖς σὺ τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὰς ἀνομίας** ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐσόμεθα σοί ("You yourself shall take away our lawlessness and sin, and we will be yours"; 34:9d). Although Moses' confident command never receives an explicit answer, whether positive or negative, the theme of transformation in Exodus is unmistakable.

In Deuteronomy, however, no such theme is present. Indeed, Israel's subsequent wilderness provocations (9:7, 22–24) only serve to show that she still struggles with the same "stiff-necked" nature. Indeed, the entire point of the cautionary comparison between Gentile ἀσέβεια ("impiety") and Israel's ἀσεβήματα ("impious acts"), which the LORD is asked to overlook rather than *take away*, seems to be that the only thing standing between Israel and the destruction facing the Gentiles is the LORD's election, especially as expressed in the oath sworn to the patriarchs (cf. 9:4, 5, 27; 10:11, 14–15, 21–22). Although Deut 10:16 commands Israelites to circumcise their hard-hearts and stiffen their necks no longer, there is nothing in the deuteronomic account of the calf to suggest that they will be able to honor such a request.

Conflation in Psalm 106(105):19–20, 23a,d. Such stark differences concerning the timing of Moses' intercession and theme of transformation did not preclude conflation of Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10 in Ps 106(105):19–23. Before discussing that conflation, however, we must briefly recall what we have already learned about vv. 19–23. We have seen that the description of forgetting God and his wonders in vv. 21–22

points backward to vv. 7–10, contributing to the terminological centrality of the calf account (cf. p. 261). We have also seen that v. 23b participates in the intertextual centrality of the calf account, portraying the partial transfer of Aaron’s intercessory role from Num 16:46–50 to that of Moses, a role that is then more completely transferred to Phinehas in v. 30 (cf. p. 223). That leaves vv. 19–20, 23a,d as the verses in which allusions to the golden calf accounts of Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10 have been conflated.

We begin with vv. 19–20. These two verses, as we shall see, reflect a contextually-sensitive interpretation of Exod 32–34. Verses 19–20 are as follows:

Table 35. Ps 106(105):19–20

¹⁹ καὶ ἐποίησαν μόσχον ἐν Χωρήβ καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ γλυπτῷ. ²⁰ καὶ ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον.	¹⁹ And they made a calf at Horeb and they worshiped the graven image: ²⁰ and they changed their glory for the likeness of a calf that eats grass.
--	--

Verse 19 alludes generally to the creation of the calf in Exod 32:1–6 as well as evoking, in particular, the LORD’s disclosure of the people’s transgression to Moses in Exod 32:8b: ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς μόσχον καὶ προσεκυνήκασιν αὐτῷ (“They made for themselves a calf and have worshiped it”). Two differences between v. 19 and Exod 32:8b deserve comment. First, in place of the pronoun αὐτός (“it”), the noun γλυπτός (“graven image”) has been substituted in v. 19b, which, as we have seen, looks forward in the psalm to Israel’s worship of Gentile graven images in vv. 36a, 38c (cf. p. 220). Second, the location ἐν Χωρήβ (“at Horeb”) has been added to the end of v. 19a. Although the preferred designation for Sinai in Deuteronomy (1:2, 6, 19; 4:10, 15; 5:2; 9:8; 18:16; 29:1), the name Horeb also occurs in Exodus (3:1; 17:6; 33:6) and the

addition here, in light of the interplay between vv. 19–20, almost certainly forms part of an allusion to Exod 33:6.

To understand the interplay between vv. 19–20 requires that we recall yet another previous point. We noted above the antithetic parallelism between Exod 32:2–3 and 33:5–6 (cf. p. 235). Whereas the former text recounts the people’s covenantal disobedience in complying with Aaron’s command to take off their golden earrings so that he could manufacture a calf, symbolizing the acquisition of illegitimate divine presence in the Land, the latter text recounts the people’s covenantal obedience in complying with the LORD’s command to take off their *στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν* (“robes of glory”) and remaining jewelry, symbolizing the loss of legitimate divine presence in the Land. Ps 106(105):19–20 succinctly expresses this antithetic parallelism between Exod 32:2–3 and 33:5–6. The people who made and worshipped a calf at Horeb changed *δόξαν αὐτῶν* (“their glory”) for the likeness of a grass-eating calf. Literally, the reference to “their glory” refers to the golden earrings that were molded into the calf and also to the subsequent divestment of finery, especially glorious robes. Metaphorically, however, “their glory” refers to the loss of divine presence occasioned by the calf. As we shall see, Paul’s allusion to Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23 presupposes this metaphorical view. Finally, since the rest of the Exodus calf account (33:7ff.) concerns the reclamation of the LORD’s glorious presence through covenant restoration, culminating with Moses’ glorified complexion as he descends the mountain (34:29ff.), Ps 106(105):19–20 must be credited with mediating a contextually-sensitive interpretation of Exod 32–34, one oriented to the nadir of the account.

The evocation of Deut 9–10 in Ps 106(105):23a,d, even if especially dependent on one term,¹¹¹ likewise reflects contextual awareness. To facilitate understanding of this evocation, it will be helpful to cite v. 23 as a whole with the term in bold:

Table 36. Ps 106(105):23

<p>²³ καὶ εἶπεν τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι αὐτούς, εἰ μὴ Μωυσῆς ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς αὐτοῦ ἔστη ἐν τῇ θραύσει ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι τὴν ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ μὴ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι.</p>	<p>²³ And he spoke in order to destroy them, except that Moses his chosen one stood in the shattering before him to turn away his wrath in order that he would not destroy [them].</p>
--	---

As reflected in this chart, the *Leitwort* ἐξολεθρεύω (“destroy”) of Deut 9–10 frames Moses’ intercession in v. 23. We have seen (cf. p. 249) that in Deut 9–10 this verb appears three times in reference to the LORD’s impending destruction of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land (9:3, 4, 5) and then recurs throughout the retelling of the golden calf incident (9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10), serving as an integral part of the cautionary comparison between Gentile ἀσέβεια (“impiety”; 9:4, 5), which *would lead* to destruction, and Israel’s ἀσέβημα (“impious act”; 9:27), which *had nearly led* to destruction. The precise manner in which ἐξολεθρεύω is employed in v. 23a,d suggests a contextually-sensitive appropriation of the destructive drama surrounding Moses’ intercession in Deut 9–10. Indeed, this intercession begins with the LORD threatening to

¹¹¹ In the MT, two terms are utilized in the allusion: the hiphil of מַשִּׁי, which evokes Deut 9:8, 14, 19, 25; and the hiphil of נָהַרַ, which especially evokes Deut 10:10. Since both Hebrew terms are translated by ἐξολεθρεύω in LXX Deuteronomy, the twofold employment of ἐξολεθρεύω in LXX Ps 105:23 coheres with the intertextual relationship in the MT. Moreover, given that, as Smith (“Linguistic,” 172) observes, ἐξολεθρεύω is the only equivalent used in LXX Psalms for מַשִּׁי (cf. 37[36]:38; 83[82]:11; 92[91]:8; 106[105]:23, 34; 145[144]:20), while ἐξολεθρεύω renders the hiphil of נָהַרַ only here, with διαφθείρω used for the other eight occurrences (cf. 14[13]:1; 53[52]:2; 57[56]:1; 58[57]:1; 59[58]:1; 75[74]:1; 78[77]:38, 45), the LXX translator may have even intentionally preserved the intertextual relationship with Deuteronomy through his choice of a translation equivalent otherwise unparalleled in LXX Psalms.

destroy Israel and concludes when that threat is past. Moreover, given that ἐξολεθρεύω is central to the less than flattering comparison of Gentile and Jewish conduct in Deut 9–10, the evocation in Ps 106(105):23 may further serve as a metaleptic anticipation of Israel’s Gentile-like behavior in vv. 34–46. Even if this behavior did not lead to Israel’s destruction, it did, as the end of Ps 106(105) makes clear, lead to Exile.

Rebellion Inside the Land: Cyclical Sin (vv. 34–46)

Following the preceding discussion of Israel’s septet of sins outside of the Land (vv. 7–33), with particular attention having been paid to the centrality of the calf account (vv. 19–23), especially its conflation of Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10, we shall now examine vv. 34–46, the next major section in Ps 106(105). With these verses, there is a significant geographical and temporal shift. Geographically, Israel now finds herself in the Land, not outside of it. Temporally, not only is the Mosaic era past but so is that of Joshua, which is skipped over in silence. Omitting mention of Israel’s judges, vv. 34–46 recall the cyclical pattern of sin and rescue as outlined in Judg 2:6–3:6.¹¹² The murderous blood-letting in the Land also evokes Num 35:33–34. Structurally, vv. 34–46 divide into three parts: vv. 34–40, 41–42, and 43–46. I shall briefly discuss each part in turn.

As Pierre Auffret has noted, vv. 34–40 are marked by the following elaborate chiasm of key words:¹¹³

¹¹² This is true whether one is considering LXX A or B. On the difference between these two text-types, see Philip E. Satterthwaite, “Judges: To the Reader,” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; Oxford: Oxford University, 2007), 195–200[195–96].

¹¹³ “‘Afin’,” 83–84. Similarly, Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 68. The edge of this chiasm is slightly obscured in LXX translation, as in the MT the term **עַם** appears in v. 34 and v. 40, representing the Gentiles in the former and Israel in the latter. Also, in v. 38b **וּבְנוֹתֵיהֶם** is rendered by *καὶ θυγατέρων* rather than by *καὶ θυγατέρων αὐτῶν*, reducing the degree of parallelism with **אֶת־בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם** / *τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν* in v. 37b.

τὰ ἔθνη (“the Gentiles”; v. 34)
 κύριος (“LORD”)
 τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν (“their works”; v. 35)
 τοῖς γλυπτοῖς αὐτῶν (“to their idols”; v. 36)
 ἔθυσαν (“they sacrificed”; v. 37)
 υἱοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ... θυγατέρας (“their sons and ... daughters”)
 αἷμα (“blood”; v. 38)
 αἷμα (“blood”)¹¹⁴
 υἱῶν αὐτῶν καὶ θυγατέρων (“their sons and daughters”)
 ἔθυσαν (“they sacrificed”)
 τοῖς γλυπτοῖς Χανάαν (“to the idols of Canaan”)
 τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτῶν (“with their works”; v. 39)
 κύριος (“LORD”; v. 40)
 τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (“his people”)

This chiasm traces the bloody defilement of the Land, prohibited in Num 35:33–34, to Israel’s sacrifice of her own children to Canaanite idols, idols served as a consequence of mixing with and learning from the very Gentile inhabitants whom Israel disobediently failed to destroy, a failure that led the LORD to become enraged at his own people, even to the point of abhorring his κληρονομία (“inheritance”; v. 40). As in v. 6, there is likely a word-play at work here. The LORD abhorred his κληρονομία (i.e., Israel) because, by virtue of her disobedience, the κληρονομία (i.e., Land) remained a *Gentile* one. Such extreme anger on the LORD’s part in v. 40 proves understandable in light of the summary characterization that immediately precedes in v. 39b: καὶ ἐπόρνευσαν ἐν τοῖς

¹¹⁴ Against the proposal of Kraus (*Psalms 60–150*, 316), for example, that v. 38b–c represents a gloss in the MT, Allen (*Psalms 101–150*, 65) observes: “The text is vindicated by its stylistic role in the context....”

ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν (“and they [the Israelites] played the harlot in their practices”).¹¹⁵

Israel’s spiritual infidelity, expressed in imitation of and assimilation to the Canaanites, presumably including intermarriage (cf. Judg 2:6), if left unchecked, would have meant the cessation of her existence as a distinct people, thereby annulling her covenantal relationship and allowing the Land to remain a *Gentile* one forever.

Thus the LORD’s reaction in vv. 41–42 must be understood as both punitive and preservative. These verses also take a chiasmic form:¹¹⁶

καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς **χεῖρας** ἐθνῶν,
καὶ ἐκυρίευσαν αὐτῶν οἱ μισοῦντες αὐτούς·
καὶ ἔθλιψαν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν,
καὶ ἐταπεινώθησαν ὑπὸ τὰς **χεῖρας** αὐτῶν.¹¹⁷

And he gave them into the **hands** of Gentiles,
and those hating them ruled them:
and their enemies afflicted them,
and they were humbled by their **hands**.

If, earlier in the psalm, Israel was saved from her enemies (cf vv. 10–11), she is now given over to them. These enemies, however, act as the LORD’s agents in both punishing and, consequently, preserving his people by keeping them distinct from, rather than assimilated to, the Gentile inhabitants of the Land. Paul’s appropriation of παρέδωκεν

¹¹⁵ Smith (“Linguistic,” 197–98) argues against a metaphorical meaning for πορνεύω, concluding that “In the Greek ... verse 39 does not summarize the foregoing litany of wrongs but adds yet another, that of prostitution.” It is unlikely, however, that a metaphorical meaning can be excluded, given the repeated metaphorical use of words with the πορν- root in the LXX (e.g. Num 14:33). Cf. n. 31.

¹¹⁶ So Dahood, *Psalms III*, 75; Auffret, “‘Afin’,” 84.

¹¹⁷ There is word-play that is lost in LXX translation between the terms כָּנַע (rendered by ταπεινώω) in v. 42 and כָּנַע (rendered by Χανάαν) in v. 38c. Those who identify this Hebrew word-play include: Auffret, “‘Afin’,” 84; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 65, 73.

αὐτοὺς [ὁ θεός] (“[God] gave them over”; v. 41a; cf. Rom 1:24, 26a, 28), in contrast, seems to be exclusively punitive, lacking the preservative function of the expression in Ps 106(105). I shall return to this matter of Pauline appropriation shortly.

Finally, verses 43–46 recount the cyclical pattern of salvation and sin that subsequently ensues. When the punishment becomes too much, the LORD looks upon the affliction of his people, hears their prayer, and saves them. That the LORD saves them repeatedly implies that the people continue to flirt with assimilation to the Gentile inhabitants of the Land, starting the punitive and preservative process over again. Throughout, the LORD remembers his covenant and relents according to his great mercy, even causing Israel to be pitied by those who have taken her captive. This divinely induced pity in v. 46, while applying in the first instance to Israel’s captivity during the Judges period, would no doubt prove comforting to Israelites in Exile (cf. 1 Kgs 8:50), who then in v. 47 conclude the psalm by praying for restoration for the purpose of renewed praise.

Anticipating Paul’s Appropriation of Psalm 106(105)

In the penultimate section of this chapter, before moving on to an examination of Rom 1:18–2:11 in the next chapter, a few general comments are in order concerning the relationship between the detailed exegesis of Ps 106(105) presented above, including the extensive analysis of Exod 32–34 as well as Deut 9–10, and Paul’s own appropriation of these texts. The initial question to address is whether I presume that Paul’s reading, or that of other Second Temple Jews, matched my own in every respect.¹¹⁸ The answer is

¹¹⁸ The same question could be posed regarding the author of MT Ps 106 and his interpretation of the Pentateuch and then subsequently the translator of LXX Ps 105 and his interpretation of the Pentateuch.

no. To invoke Francis Watson's notion of complex conversation discussed in chapter three, such a presumption underestimates the agency of interpreters. One should not assume, for example, that the transfer of Aaron's intercessory role in Num 16:46–50 partially to Moses in Ps 106(105):23 and then more fully to Phinehas in v. 30 was widely known, much less that it played a key role in Paul's interpretation of the psalm.

Yet, this concession does not imply that there is no insight into Second Temple Jewish interpretation, Pauline or otherwise, to be gained from engaging in careful textual analysis for oneself. To invoke Watson's notion of complex conversation again, such an implication underestimates the agency of texts, which often invite their own readings. Indeed, we have unearthed several insightful examples of textual agency in this chapter. Two may be cited. First, in my reading of Exod 32–34 I realized that, as part of broader chiasmic pattern, Exod 34:10c recalls Exod 33:16c. This interpretation then found confirmation in as well as provided insight into Deut 10:14–15, 21–22, which, as we have seen (cf. p. 261), recall each of these texts respectively. Second, the antithetic parallelism between Exod 32:2–3 and Exod 33:5–6 also finds expression in and yields insight into Ps 106(105):19–20 (cf. p. 270).

As we anticipate Paul's appropriation of Ps 106(105), to be discussed at length in chapter five, and then make proposals regarding how other Second Temple Jews may have understood Ps 106(105) and the texts associated with it in chapter six, the following must be kept in mind. Although Paul may not have placed quite the premium on the centrality of the calf account in vv. 19–23 as I have, his decision to evoke the inglorious

For the sake of simplicity, however, I am concentrating here on Paul and his fellow Second Temple Jewish contemporaries.

“change” of v. 20 in Rom 1:23 and utilize “exchange” language in Rom 1:25, 26a nonetheless suggests that he placed considerable significance on the calf account. Moreover, we may plausibly assume that some, perhaps all, of the factors accounting for the centrality of the calf account (positional, terminological, intertextual, thematic) informed Paul’s understanding of the text, even if inchoately. Likewise, one cannot be sure that Paul discerned the elaborate chiasm of key-words in Ps 106(105):34–40. Yet, his decision to adopt the subsequent phrase παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ θεός] (“[God] gave them over”; v. 41a), employ it punitively in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28 against what appears to be *exclusively* Gentile idolatry and immorality and then apply it inferentially against a Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:1–4, suggests that Paul discerned what the elaborate chiasm of key-words was designed to highlight: the “Canaanization of Israel.”¹¹⁹ Similar sentiments could be expressed regarding the hermeneutical significance of Deut 9:27; 10:16, 17, which are alluded to in Rom 2:5, 11, and the implicit interpretation of Exod 34:8–10 in Wis 15:1–6. At this point, however, enough has been said to demonstrate the value of the preceding analysis for Pauline interpretation and that of other Second Temple Jews. Indeed, such analysis both guards against forcing Ps 106(105) into the mold of Paul’s thought and allows us to understand how Paul’s reading, or that of other Second Temple Jews, actualizes the semantic potential of this text as well as those associated with it.

¹¹⁹ Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 68.

Conclusion

This chapter has been devoted to a close reading of Ps 106(105), one that included a lengthy examination of Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10. We have seen that the golden calf incident, as recounted in Ps 106(105):19–23, is an intertextual amalgamation of Exod 32–34, Deut 9–10, and even Num 16:46–50. In terms of its significance within the psalm, the golden calf incident is centrally positioned as the fourth of seven Israelite sins outside of the Land. The incident previews Israel’s subsequent idolatry as well as participates in and serves as a turning point for thematic progression related to the severity of Israel’s sin and the LORD’s corresponding reaction to that sin in vv. 7–33. Once inside the Land, Israel’s idolatrous and immoral imitation of the Gentile inhabitants, expressed in an elaborate chiasm of key-words in vv. 34–40, enrages the LORD and leads him in vv. 41–42 to give her over to oppression by these Gentiles, an act that is both punitive and preservative. The cyclical pattern of salvation and sin follows in vv. 43–46 before giving way to a concluding plea for restoration in v. 47, which makes explicit what was implicit in vv. 4–5, namely Israel’s exilic state.

Thus what emerges from this close reading of Ps 106(105) is that v. 20 and also v. 41a, the ones upon which Paul drew, occur at key junctures within the psalm. In the penultimate section, I argued that although one should not presume that Paul’s reading matched the one presented here, this exegesis of Ps 106(105) and associated texts nevertheless allows for insight into Paul’s interpretation and that of other Second Temple Jews. Such insight will, in turn, prove crucial for the remaining chapters. In chapter five, I propose that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation in Rom

1:18–2:11; and in chapter six I explore the possibility that this analysis of Paul’s argumentation points to a particular conversation about differing understandings of Jewish identity, involving Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106).

CHAPTER 5

ROMANS 1:18–2:11

Introduction

Following the lengthy analysis of Ps 106(105) and associated texts in the preceding chapter, we are now in a position to see how Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11, argumentation in which evocations of the calf play a prominent role. At the same time, we shall also see how the proper alignment of all four pavement stones introduced in chapter one and discussed at length in chapter two allow one to discern the influence of Ps 106(105). To make this case regarding the psalmic substructure of Paul’s argumentation and the precise manner in which the four pavement stones interlock, the present chapter approaches Rom 1:18–2:11 from three distinct though interrelated vantage points: structural, substructural, and surface analysis. A section is devoted to each in turn.

Calling for a paradigm reorientation, the structural analysis section will show that Paul’s argument in Rom 1:18–32 (especially vv. 22–32) hinges on the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”) in vv. 23, 25, 26b and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in vv. 24, 26a, 28, one that creates a sin–retribution sequence with an *a–ba–ba–b* pattern (vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, 28–32). Through an inferential Διό (“Therefore”) and the charge of doing/practicing τά ... αὐτά (“the same

things”) or τα τοιαῦτα (“such things”), Rom 2:1–4 then incorporates an unidentified interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence. Thus pavement stones one (Διό: a problematic particle) and two (τά ... αὐτά and τὰ τοιαῦτα: an uncertain similarity) may be properly aligned simply through careful attention to structure. As for pavement stone three (the unidentified interlocutor), the structural asymmetry and terminology of Rom 2:5–11 provide clues to its alignment as well. Continuing to indict the interlocutor, this portion of Paul’s argument culminates with an intricate double-chiasm concerning divine judgment, one in which references to God’s punishment Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνος (“of the Jew first and also of the Greek”; v. 9c) as well as his reward Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι (“for the Jew first and also for the Greek; v. 10c) intrude upon the parallelism. Moreover, the terms employed to depict the goal and gift of right conduct in vv. 7a, 10a, especially δόξα (“glory”), prove structurally significant as three of the four are either introduced in or may be associated with Rom 1:23. It is this intrusion of 2:9c, 10c, with their emphasis on judgment for the Jew *first*, and the structurally-significant vocabulary of vv. 7a, 10a, that yield clues to the interlocutor’s Jewish identity.

Focusing then on the scriptural evocations underlying the hinges of Paul’s argumentation, the substructural analysis section provides conclusive corroboration for identifying the interlocutor as a Jew, thereby allowing for proper alignment of pavement stone three. This section examines: the conflated evocations of Ps 106(105):20 and Gen 1:20–27 in Rom 1:23; the punitive use of Ps 106(105):41a in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28; and the indirect employment of Ps 106(105):23a,d in Rom 2:5–11, by means of allusions to Deut 9–10. Since each evocation considered either draws from or arguably was inspired by Ps

106(105), this psalm may be regarded as constituting the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

The surface analysis section reads Rom 1:18–2:11 in light of the preceding analyses, showing how attention to the rhetorical role of Ps 106(105), including its ironic, inferential, and indirect application, leads to a coherent and even compelling interpretation of the text. I shall also note the relevance of Wis 13–15 to understanding Paul's argument, especially its polemical form and the manner in which Paul subverts that form. Thus pavement stone four (a possible dialogue partner in Wis 11–19 [esp. chaps. 13–15]), at the very least, represents the kind of tradition Paul is engaging. That Paul's decision to construct his argument in Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, a particular conversation about differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106) is what I explore in chapter six. With this outline in mind, we begin with structural analysis.

Structural Analysis

Paul's argument in Rom 1:18–2:11 divides into three parts: 1:18–32; 2:1–4; and 2:5–11. In this section, I consider the structure of each. Particular attention is paid to the first part, however, since scholarly understanding has been marred by a misleading paradigm.¹

¹ The subsection on the structure Rom 1:18–32 essentially reproduces Alec J. Lucas, "Reorienting the Structural Paradigm and Social Significance of Romans 1:18–32," *JBL* 131 (2012): 103–22[103–16].

Romans 1:18–32: Reorienting the Paradigm around an *A–BA–BA–B* Pattern

In commenting on Rom 1:18–32, James D. G. Dunn highlights the structural significance of the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”; 1:23, 25, 26) and the verb that is part of the expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”; 1:24, 26, 28). This interplay, according to Dunn, creates “a powerful sense of the vicious circle of human sin—failure to acknowledge God leading to degenerate religion and behavior, human pride reaping the fruit of human depravity (vv 24, 26–27) and general nastiness (vv 29–31).”² To the exegete who is acquainted with the Greek text of Rom 1:18–32 but *not* scholarship on this text, Dunn’s observations may seem to state the obvious. Indeed, how could such an interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν and παρέδωκεν be ignored? What is not so obvious, however, is why this interplay has, in fact, not occupied a prominent place in scholarly discourse on Rom 1:18–32, occasional claims to the contrary notwithstanding. Regarding the latter, consider these remarks by Joseph A.

Fitzmyer:

Attempts have been made time and again to uncover the structure of vv 18–32 by appeal to the threefold use of (*met*)ēllaxan, ‘they exchanged’ (1:23, 25, 26) or of *paredōken*, ‘he delivered over’ (1:24, 26, 28) or of *dioti*, ‘because,’ *dio*, and *dia touto* (1:21, 24, 26): so Klostermann (‘Die adäquate Vergeltung’); Schulz (‘Die Anklage’), Jeremias (‘Zu Röm’) [*sic*], Lyonnet (‘La Structure’); Bouwman (‘Noch einmal’); Popkes (‘Zum Aufbau’). But there is little agreement about the structure. It seems best to follow Dunn (*Romans*, 53) and divide the passage (after the topic sentence) according to content in this way: (1) vv 19–23—sin against the truth of God; (2) vv 24–27—sin against nature; (3) vv 28–32—sin against other human beings.³

² *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1988), 53. See also p. 75.

³ *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 276.

As it turns out, Fitzmyer is wrong on several counts. Dunn does not divide Rom 1:18–32 as claimed. The delineation attributed to him actually comes from Alphonse Maillot;⁴ Dunn merely notes this delineation without necessarily endorsing it.⁵ Moreover, judging from the scholars cited by Fitzmyer, the repeated attempts to uncover the structure of Rom 1:18–32 have focused on the threefold use of παρέδωκεν (“[God] gave over”) to the exclusion of (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”). Finally, even if these structural analyses of Rom 1:18–32 differ at various points, there is widespread agreement in that the 1933 article “Appropriate Retribution in Rom 1:22–31” by Erich Klostermann has set the terms of the debate.⁶ Indeed, scholarly reactions to this article may be understood in terms of a dialectic, with Klostermann’s proposal, including its endorsement by Siegfried Schulz and subsequent development by Joachim Jeremias, Wiard Popkes, and Jouette M. Bassler, serving in various ways as the “Thesis,” Stanislas Lyonnet’s objections playing the part of “Antithesis,” and the analysis of G. Bouwman taking on the role of “Synthesis.” It is this dialectic, especially the word-plays associated with it, that has led exegetes to neglect the structurally significant interaction between (μετ)ήλλαξαν and παρέδωκεν.

The present subsection first sketches the dialectical history of scholarship on Rom 1:18–32.⁷ I then suggest that a paradigm reorientation is in order. This reoriented

⁴ *L'Épître aux Romains* (Paris: Le Centurion, 1984), 69–70.

⁵ See Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 53.

⁶ “Die adäquate Vergeltung in Rm 1, 22–31,” *ZNW* 32 (1933): 1–6.

⁷ The adoption of a dialectic to organize and assess this scholarly history, including the manner in which it is applied (cf. n. 25 below), is a heuristic device. I do not intend to imply that this is the only way

paradigm identifies Rom 1:18–21 as an introduction to the indictment proper in 1:22–32, which possesses an *a–ba–ba–b* structure based upon the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν and παρέδωκεν. Of crucial importance for my overall thesis is that both elements of the triadic interplay derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively, the significance of which I shall return to in subsequent sections. For now, we turn to the history of scholarship on Rom 1:18–32.

Dialectical History of Scholarship

Thesis: E. Klostermann et al.

Initial Articulation and Early Endorsement: E. Klostermann (1933) and S. Schulz (1958). Erich Klostermann begins his brief but influential article by criticizing the paragraph-delineation and sentence-punctuation for Rom 1:22ff. in contemporary Greek NTs. In general, they place too much division between vv. 23 and 24 and too little between vv. 24 and 25. Following these criticisms, Klostermann identifies what he regards as the correct textual division: vv. 22–24; vv. 25–27; and vv. 28ff. It would prove significant, in terms of the history of scholarship, that Klostermann’s division does not clearly indicate that the third section, vv. 28ff., extends only to v. 31, not v. 32. Although this is reflected in the title of his article, it is explicitly stated nowhere else. The only indication is found in a footnote. Having stated in the body of the text that the οἵτινες (“who”) at the beginning of v. 25 is to be taken prospectively, not retrospectively (i.e. it does not refer back to those whom God gave-over but looks forward to those who exchange God’s truth for falsehood), and that the verse as a whole is an independent

to organize a review of literature on the structure of Rom 1:18–32, much less that scholarship inevitably took this form.

sentence, not a dependent one, Klostermann apparently felt compelled to comment on the οἵτινες at the beginning of v. 32. Why? Undoubtedly, because he recognized that the οἵτινες of v. 32 presents a problem for his analysis of v. 25: since v. 32 is almost universally regarded as dependent on the preceding verses, with a break following at 2:1, it could be claimed that the clearly retrospective οἵτινες of v. 32 serves as a guide for how to read its earlier occurrence in v. 25. And so, in anticipation of just such an objection, Klostermann relegates to a footnote the observation that Hans Lietzmann translates the οἵτινες of v. 32 as “For they” (perhaps implying that it may be understood prospectively) and he then states: “The problem of the connection of verses 1:32 and 2:1 ff. ... with one another and with the entire context may surely be disregarded here.”⁸ Klostermann, in other words, avoids the issue. This is a point to which we shall return.

The rest of Klostermann’s article is more straightforward. The textual division he advocates has at its center the expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”; Rom 1:24, 26a, 28). The material preceding each occurrence establishes the ground for God’s “giving-over” and what follows is “appropriate retribution.” Paul has thus formulated his opening indictment according to the ancient principle of *lex talionis*, a principle found explicitly stated or implicitly illustrated in numerous texts, including Wis 11:6ff., 15–16; 18:4–5; 2 Macc 5:9–10; 9:5ff.; 13:7; *Jub.* 4.32; *T. Gad.* 5.9–11; Philo, *Flacc.* 170. Finally, Klostermann finds corroboration for the structural importance of this principle throughout Rom 1:22–31 in a series of word-plays for each section of the text: for vv. 22–24: δόξαν (“glory”; v. 23) and ἀτιμάζεσθαι (“to dishonor”; v. 24); for vv.

⁸“Von dem Problem der Verbindung der ... Verse 1₃₂ und 2₁ ff. untereinander und mit dem ganzen Zusammenhang darf hier wohl abgesehen werden,” “adäquate Vergeltung,” 2, n. 1.

25–27: μετήλλαξαν (“they exchanged”; v. 25) and μετήλλαξαν (“they exchanged”; v. 26b); and for vv. 28–31: οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν (“they did not see fit”; v. 28a) and ἀδόκιμον (“unfit”; v. 28b).⁹ As we shall see, the adoption of these word-plays, however, has led scholars to neglect the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (vv. 23, 25, 26b) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (vv. 24, 26a, 28).

Turning to Siegfried Schulz, the primary concern of his 1958 article “The Indictment in Rom 1:18–32” is not the structure of the text but its constituent traditions.¹⁰ Schulz argues that the base-layer of Rom 1:18–32 is Jewish Apocalyptic, as found in Qumran, through which the OT has been mediated, and that Hellenistic apologetic elements also appear, though within the larger framework of an indictment. This particular combination of traditions is pre-Pauline but not pre-Christian. In the course of making his argument, Schulz endorses Klostermann’s structural analysis regarding Rom 1:22–31 and the word-plays associated with it.¹¹ What is unique about Schulz’s article is not that it adopts Klostermann’s proposal but that it does so without changing the scope of that proposal.

Secondary Developments: J. Jeremias (1954) and W. Popkes (1982). Four years earlier and apparently unknown to Schulz, Joachim Jeremias had also adopted Klostermann’s proposal in his “On Rom 1:22–32.”¹² So convincing did Jeremias find the

⁹ These word-plays were adopted early on by A. Feuillet, “Le Plan Salvifique de Dieu d’après l’Épître aux Romains: Essai sur la structure littéraire de l’Épître et sa signification théologique,” *RB* 57 (1950): 336–87[345, n. 2]. Cf. n. 14 for scholars who would subsequently adopt them as well.

¹⁰ “Die Anklage in Röm. 1,18—32,” *TZ* 14: 161–73.

¹¹ Schulz, “Die Anklage in Röm. 1,18—32,” 166–67.

¹² “Zu Rm 1 22–32,” *ZNW* 45: 119–21.

analysis and associated word-plays that he expresses astonishment that they had not yet garnered wider acceptance. Jeremias, for his part, notes that Klostermann overlooked two close parallels in which the principle of *lex talionis* is expressed. One is Acts 7:41–42, which, like Rom 1:22–24, concerns the golden calf incident (cf. Ps 106[105]:20) and employs the key verb παρέδωκεν (“[God] gave over”). The other is *T. Naph.* 3.2–4. Jeremias judges this parallel even more important as it shows that this retributive principle was equally at home in Palestinian Judaism as in Hellenistic Judaism. This is significant for Jeremias because the point of his article, besides bolstering Klostermann’s analysis, is to suggest that Rom 1:18–32 does not reflect Paul’s missionary preaching to Gentiles (the conventional view of his time), but rather has preparatory character for Paul’s engagement with Jewish synagogue assumptions in Rom 2:1–3:20.

Whether intentional or not, what is most notable about Jeremias’s contribution is that he extends the scope of Klostermann’s analysis. Indeed, at the outset, Jeremias says, “E. Klostermann has ... in a concise, exemplary essay proved that in Rom 1:22–32 the appropriate retribution of God is portrayed in threefold repetition.”¹³ Jeremias then identifies the textual divisions advocated by Klostermann as vv. 22–24, vv. 25–27, and vv. 28–32. Nowhere is there any indication that the original scope of Klostermann’s article extended only to v. 31, not v. 32. Significantly, Jeremias’s analysis would subsequently be conflated with that of Klostermann and adopted by many scholars, even

¹³ “E. Klostermann hat ... in einem auch in seiner Knappheit vorbildlichen Aufsatz nachgewiesen, daß Rm 1 22–32 in dreifacher Wiederholung die adäquate Vergeltung Gottes geschildert wird,” “Zu Rm 1 22–32,” 119.

though the parallelism between the οἷτινες (“who”) in v. 25 and the one in v. 32 arguably presents a problem for this view.¹⁴

If Jeremias extended the scope of Klostermann’s analysis in one direction, then Wiard Popkes in his 1982 article, “On the Structure and Character of Romans 1:18–32,” extended it in the other.¹⁵ Embracing the emphasis on παρέδωκεν and the associated word-plays, he argued that the section begins not at v. 22 but at v. 21.¹⁶ Popkes then further proposed that vv. 21–24 play a dual role. On the one hand, following the general judgment of v. 18 and the charge of inexcusability in vv. 19–20, they bring to a close Paul’s opening line of thought by depicting the fundamental human error (vv. 21–23) and the divine consequences for that error (v. 24). On the other hand, vv. 21–24 are also the first of three blocks of text (vv. 21–24, vv. 25–27, vv. 28–31) that reiterate the cycle of human misconduct, divine reaction, and consequences, with v. 32 then concluding the whole.¹⁷ In view of his overall proposal, Popkes’s article takes on additional significance

¹⁴ Scholars who explicitly endorse Klostermann or the Klostermann–Jeremias view include: Jacques Dupont, “Le Problème de la Structure Littéraire de l’Épître aux Romains,” *RB* 62 (1955): 365–97[392–93, n. 3]; Joseph Huby, *Épître aux Romains: Traduction et Commentaire* (new ed.; rev. P. Stanislas Lyonnet; *VS* 10; Paris: Beauchesne, 1957), 93; Franz J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary* (trans. Harold Knight; Cleveland: World Publishing, 1961), 66, n. †; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; London: T & T Clark, 1975), 1:105, 106, n. 1, 119, n. 4; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Geoffrey Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 44. Scholars who endorse the word-plays associated with the Klostermann–Jeremias position without necessarily adopting the rest of the analysis include: Andrew T. Lincoln, “From Wrath to Justification: Tradition, Gospel, and Audience in the Theology of Romans 1:18–4:25,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers* (ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr.; *SBLSP* 32; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 194–226[205]; Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 100; Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 165; Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology* (WUNT 2/256; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 122.

¹⁵ “Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32,” *NTS* 28: 490–501.

¹⁶ Popkes, “Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32,” 493, 497, 498, 500, n. 14.

¹⁷ See the structural outline in Popkes, “Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32,” 499.

as well: it shows that Klostermann's influence may be discerned in what otherwise looks like a very different and more elaborate analysis.¹⁸

Tertiary Developments: J. M. Bassler (1982). Yet another development of Klostermann's "Thesis" occurs with Jouette M. Bassler in her 1982 monograph on divine impartiality.¹⁹ She did not, like Jeremias and Popkes, extend the scope of Klostermann's original proposal so much as build upon that proposal. Bassler suggests that there are not three parallel subsections (vv. 22–24, vv. 25–27, vv. 28–31) depicting appropriate retribution but four, including Rom 1:32–2:3 as well. She reasons as follows:

The *second* subsection (vv. 25–27) ... does not mention a new sin and punishment, but restates what was said in the *first*—exchanging worship of the Creator for idolatry results in the punishment of sexual perversion. Similarly, our newly defined *fourth* subsection, which, like the second, opens with οἵτινες, expands the message of the *third*—failure to acknowledge God results in a debased mind that condones improper conduct. Thus the pattern here appears actually to be IAB/IIAB:

IA:	1:22–24,	B (οἵτινες)	1:25–27
IIA:	1:28–31,	B (οἵτινες)	1:32ff. ²⁰

Having earlier acknowledged that the οἵτινες ("who") of v. 32 is problematic for Klostermann,²¹ Bassler attempts to eliminate that difficulty by incorporating it into her analysis in a manner that parallels the οἵτινες of v. 25. This, of course, means venturing into Rom 2 and in taking such a step it is important for Bassler to find evidence for general continuity between the chapters and for the notion of *lex talionis*, in particular.

¹⁸ Jewett (*Romans*, 165) also comes to mind in this regard.

¹⁹ *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (SBLDS 59; Chico: Scholars).

²⁰ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 132, italics in original.

²¹ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 256, n. 46.

She finds general continuity in the alternation between ποιέω (“do”) and πράσσω (“practice”) in relation to τὰ αὐτά (“the same things”) and τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) in Rom 1:28, 32; 2:1–3 as well as in the sevenfold use of κρίν– (“judg”–) words in 2:1–3, which are bracketed by δικαίωμα (“righteous requirement”) in 1:32 and δικαιοκρισία (“righteous judgment”) in 2:5. As for the particular notion of *lex talionis*, Bassler points to the linguistic link in v. 1 that the one who acts as a judge (κρίνω) condemns (κατακρίνω) himself, and the broad restatement of this idea in v. 3.

Bassler, however, implicitly recognizes that adding a fourth retributive subsection (Rom 1:32–2:3) nonetheless leaves her with a lingering problem. It is that in the first three subsections the concept of measure-for-measure retribution is conveyed through the expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) and accompanying word-plays: δόξαν–ἀτιμάζεσθαι (“glory”–“to dishonor”) for vv. 22–24; μετήλλαξαν–μετήλλαξαν (“they exchanged”–“they exchanged”) for vv. 25–27; and οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν–ἀδόκιμον (“they did not see fit”–“unfit”) for vv. 28–31. Yet, Rom 1:32–2:3 lacks *both*. Bassler tries to alleviate this problem in various ways. She claims that the παρέδωκεν-theme is mirrored in ὃς ἀποδώσει (“who will repay”), even though the latter phrase does not occur until Rom 2:6 (i.e. outside the textual unit identified by Bassler). As we have seen, she points to the linguistic link between κρίνω (“judge”) and κατακρίνω (“condemn”) in Rom 2:1. The difficulty here is that both elements of this word-play occur together whereas in all of the other instances the first element serves as the ground for the divine “giving-over” to a corresponding retribution signaled by the second element. Bassler concedes this point when she says, “The observation that periods IIA

and IIB are somehow coordinated yields the insight that the adequate retribution, instead of being introduced in the διό clause [of Rom 2:1], is indicated already in the accusation of v. 32....”²² She then argues that “Those who failed to *acknowledge God* (v. 28) are punished not only by becoming evildoers themselves (vv. 28b–31) but also, as a particularly appropriate response to this failure, by *approving evildoers*” in v. 32, a correspondence reflected in its own word-play: οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν (“they did not approve”) in v. 28 and συνευδοκοῦσιν (“they applaud”) in v. 32.²³ Bassler, in other words, is unable to find a parallel notion of appropriate retribution in Rom 2 and so she suggests that the sin of οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν (v. 28a) results in a twofold retribution: ἀδόκιμον νοῦν... (“an unfit mind”; vv. 28b–31) and συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν (“they applaud those who practice”; v. 32). The failure to find a parallel notion of appropriate retribution in Rom 2 undermines her proposal that Rom 1:32–2:3 constitutes a fourth subsection. There may, indeed, be connections between 1:32 and 2:1–3, but this alone does not justify identifying these verses as a fourth subsection.

Antithesis: S. Lyonnet (1957)

With the development of the “Thesis” concluded, we come now to the “Antithesis” portion of our review. Stanislas Lyonnet devotes part of a 1957 article to

²² Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 132, material in brackets mine.

²³ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 133, 256, n. 47, italics and underlining in original; translation mine.

refuting the Klostermann–Jeremias perspective on Rom 1:22–31/2.²⁴ He first compares their position with the standard analysis of his day.²⁵

Table 37. Comparison of Views on Rom 1:22–32

Standard View	Klostermann–Jeremias View
vv. 24–25	vv. 22–24
vv. 26–27	vv. 25–27
vv. 28–32	vv. 28–31/2

Both analyses, according to Lyonnet, count three periods, emphasize that vice stems from idolatry, and elucidate the theme of appropriate retribution. They differ, primarily, in the first subsection, disagreeing about where it begins and ends. The standard view takes the expression *Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός* (“Therefore, God gave them over”) of Rom 1:24 as the beginning of the first period, regarding vv. 22–23 as attached grammatically and conceptually to that which precedes. Grammatically, vv. 22–23 are linked through asyndetic apposition to v. 21 (i.e. the absence of a particle is taken as an indication of a close connection). Conceptually, the *διαλογισμοί* (“reasonings”) of v. 21 are expressed in vv. 22–23, which evoke the golden calf incident of Ps 106(105):20 to show how this sin consisted in a rejection of divine transcendence. This rejection, according to the standard view, leads to a new theme: divine retribution beginning in v. 24. The Klostermann–Jeremias position, in contrast, identifies v. 24 not as a beginning but as an end: it portrays the retribution corresponding to the sin of vv. 22–23, a

²⁴ “Notes sur l’Exégèse de l’Épître aux Romains,” *Bib* 38: 35–61.

²⁵ For scholars holding to this standard view, see Lyonnet, “Notes sur l’Exégèse de l’Épître aux Romains,” 35, n. 4. Given that this view was regarded as “standard,” prior to Klostermann, it could be identified as the “Thesis” and Klostermann’s position as the “Antithesis.” Nonetheless, I have chosen to label Klostermann’s view the “Thesis,” because it has been the predominant one since its articulation, and Lyonnet’s position the “Antithesis,” because he is reacting to Klostermann.

correspondence signified through the δόξαν–ἀτιμάζεσθαι (“glory”–“to dishonor”) word-play.

Lyonnet argues that the standard view should be retained because the Klostermann–Jeremias position suffers from several difficulties. Lyonnet points out, as noted, that Klostermann’s original analysis ended at v. 31, not v. 32. When one incorporates v. 32, denying the parallelism between οἵτινες (“who”) in vv. 25 and 32, another difficulty is exacerbated, namely the imbalance of the analysis. In the first and second subsections (vv. 22–24, vv. 25–27) the protasis expounding the sin (vv. 22–23, v. 25) is essentially balanced with the apodosis of divine punishment (vv. 24, vv. 26–27). In the third subsection (vv. 28–32), however, the protasis is only a few words in length (v. 28a), while the apodosis takes on excessive proportions (vv. 28b–32). Returning once again to the οἵτινες of v. 25, this term typically appears with retrospective reference in Paul (Rom 2:15; 9:4; 11:4; 16:4, 6, 7, 12; 1 Cor 3:17; 2 Cor 8:10; Gal 5:4; etc.), not prospective reference, as demanded by the Klostermann–Jeremias view (though cf. Rom 6:2).

Most problematic of all is the doxology of v. 25b, ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν (“who is blessed forever, amen”), in the midst of what is supposed to be the second subsection. This is problematic because doxologies in the NT almost always conclude not just a sentence but a paragraph (cf. Rom 9:5; 11:36; 16:27; Gal 1:5; Eph 3:21; Phil 4:20; 1 Tim 1:17; 6:16; 2 Tim 4:18; Heb 13:21; 1 Pet 4:11; 5:11; 2 Pet 3:18;

Jude 25; Rev 1:6).²⁶ An exception is 2 Cor 11:31 (ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι... [“The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, the one blessed forever, knows...”]). This instance, however, is not parallel to Rom 1:25b because it lacks the ἀμήν (“amen”). Since the standard view posits a break after v. 25, this doxology does not pose a problem. Although Klostermann tried to account for the doxology of v. 25b by placing it in parentheses,²⁷ Lyonnet regards this textual feature as yet another reason for preferring the standard view.²⁸

Synthesis: G. Bouwman (1973)

In his 1973 article “Once More Romans 1:21–32” G. Bouwman attempts to synthesize the views of Klostermann–Jeremias and Lyonnet in offering his own analysis.²⁹ Bouwman first notes that “All authors are in agreement that the thrice-repeated παρέδωκεν (vv. 24, 26, 28) occupies a central position and must be the starting

²⁶ The same is true of Hellenistic Jewish texts (cf. 4 Macc 18:24; 1 Esd 4:40, 59). On the use of doxologies in epistolography, see David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (LEC; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 193.

²⁷ Klostermann, “adäquate Vergeltung,” 1.

²⁸ To her credit, Bassler (*Divine Impartiality*, 201–2, 277) is the only proponent of Klostermann’s analysis who attempts, though unsuccessfully, to answer Lyonnet’s criticisms. The rest of the scholars who support his view simply ignore them, including Schulz and Popkes (cf. also n. 14 above). Since she takes the parallelism between the οἵτινες of v. 25 and the οἵτινες of v. 32 seriously in identifying Rom 1:32–2:3 as a fourth subsection, Bassler is able to disregard Lyonnet’s first and third criticisms. Her response to his second is to suggest that “increasingly brief protases are balanced by correspondingly expanded apodoses” (p. 201). The fourth objection is more problematic for Bassler. She tries to counter it by citing the finding of A. Marmorstein that much earlier than the third century CE “the doxological phrase ‘blessed be He’ (ברוך הוא) seems to have been commonly appended ... to a variety of divine names” (p. 202). The relevance of this finding to NT doxologies, however, is purely speculative and Bassler has no answer for Lyonnet’s observation regarding ἀμήν.

²⁹ “Noch einmal Römer 1,21–32,” *Bib* 54: 411–14.

point of the study.”³⁰ Where they disagree is on the relationship of guilt to punishment: Klostermann–Jeremias identify a guilt–punishment sequence whereas in Lyonnet this is reversed. They also disagree on the relevant literary criteria: for Klostermann–Jeremias the word-plays (δόξαν–ἀτιμάζεσθαι; μετήλλαξαν–μετήλλαξαν; οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν–ἄδόκιμον) surrounding the principle of corresponding retribution are decisive; for Lyonnet the twice repeated οἵτινες (“who”; vv. 25, 32) takes precedence.

Following this brief comparative review, Bouwman proceeds to critique both positions. He endorses all of Lyonnet’s criticisms of Klostermann–Jeremias, especially the doxology argument, and adds one more: “The first parallelism δόξα – ἀτιμάζεσθαι [“glory” – “to dishonor”] is not verbal, while on other hand the ἤλλαξαν [“they changed”] in v. 23 agrees almost verbatim with the μετήλλαξαν [“they exchanged”] in vv. 25f.”³¹ Turning to Lyonnet, Bouwman offers a number of criticisms. While οἵτινες (“who”) occurs in the midst of the first and third of his subsections (vv. 24–25, vv. 28–32), it does not occur in the second (vv. 26–27). Instead, we find αἱ τε γάρ... (“for both the...”; v. 26b), an expression that seems to introduce not the ground for the punishment of v. 26a, as the view of Lyonnet would imply, but a further explication of that same punishment, in accordance with the Klostermann–Jeremias position. Moreover, v. 28 clearly conforms to the sequence guilt–punishment through the οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν–ἄδόκιμον (“they did not see fit–unfit”) word-play and thus presents a problem for

³⁰ “Alle Autoren sind sich darüber einig, dass das dreifach wiederholte παρέδωκεν (V. 24.26.28) eine zentrale Stellung einnimmt und Ausgangspunkt der Untersuchung sein muss,” Bouwman, “Noch,” 411.

³¹ “Die erste Parallelität δόξα – ἀτιμάζεσθαι ist nicht wörtlich, während dagegen das ἤλλαξαν in V. 23 fast wörtlich mit dem μετήλλαξαν in V. 25f übereinstimmt,” Bouwman, “Noch,” 412–13. I have added the English translation of Greek terms.

Lyonnet's emphasis on punishment–guilt. Finally, Bouwman argues that the term ἀναπολόγητος (“without excuse”; 1:20; 2:1) functions as an *inclusio* and suggests that the text should begin with v. 21, not v. 24.³² Accordingly, Bouwman presents the following outline:³³

(a)	vv. 21–23	Guilt	(διότι)	[“wherefore”]
(b)	v. 24	Punishment	(διὸ)	[“therefore”]
(c)	v. 25	Guilt	(οἵτινες)	[“who”]
(x)	vv. 26–27	Punishment	(διὰ τοῦτο)	[“on account of this”]
(c)	v. 28a	Guilt	(καὶ καθὼς)	[“and just as”]
(b)	vv. 28b–31	Punishment	(παρέδωκεν)	[“gave over”]
(a)	v. 32	Guilt	(οἵτινες)	[“who”]

The text, in his view, is a palindrome. In the final section of his article, Bouwman relates his structural analysis to the *Sitz im Leben* of the pericope. He argues that Lyonnet has uncovered the original *Sitz im Leben* in the primitive belief that one's misfortune is a retrospective indication of guilt. Klostermann and Jeremias, however, have correctly identified Paul's use of Jewish apologetic to set up his Jewish interlocutor for indictment (Rom 2:1 ff.). Bouwman thus remains synthetic until the very end.

Concluding Reflections on the History of Scholarship

It is important to discard chronology and end our historical review with Bouwman not only because he fills out the dialectic but also because he anticipates the paradigm

³² Bouwman (“Noch,” 413, n. 1, n. 3) notes other reasons for beginning the pericope with v. 21. He endorses Lyonnet's view that vv. 21 and 22 stand in asyndetic apposition to one another. He argues that vv. 21a and 28a parallel one another, likely alluding to the motif of “knowledge” in relation to God (γνόντες τὸν θεόν in v. 21a; τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει in v. 28a). Bouwman also points to the parallelism between v. 21 (διότι γνόντες) and v. 32 (οἵτινες ... ἐπιγνόντες) in this regard. Lastly, he cites Heinrich Schlier's position that vv. 18–20 belong closely with vv. 16–17 because of the repetition of γάρ.

³³ Bouwman, “Noch,” 413, with English translation of Greek terms in brackets mine. “Guilt” and “Punishment” translate “Schuld” and “Strafe” respectively.

reorientation I shall advocate. Bouwman correctly observes that both Klostermann and Lyonnet focus exclusively on the παρέδωκεν (“[God] gave over”)-statements as a structuring principle. Interestingly, Bouwman’s analysis essentially does the same. This is in spite of the fact that he notices the lack of terminological parallelism between δόξαν–ἀτιμάζεσθαι (“glory”–“to dishonor”) and the much greater terminological parallelism between ἥλλαξαν (“they changed”) of v. 23 and the twofold occurrence of μετήλλαξαν (“they exchanged”; vv. 25, 26). Indeed, had Bouwman pursued this observation further he may have realized that the ἀτιμάζεσθαι of v. 24 parallels the later ἀτιμία (“dishonor”) of v. 26, not the earlier δόξαν of v. 23. This, in turn, could have led to the recognition that (μετ)ἥλλαξαν (vv. 23, 25, 26) is engaged in a triadic interplay with παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (vv. 24, 26, 28). As it is, however, Bouwman ultimately suggests that the punishment depicted in vv. 26–27 is the structural center of Rom 1:21–32. This suggestion is unconvincing. The primary issue in this text is idolatry (vv. 23, 25), not the consequent sexual immorality narrated in vv. 26–27.

Even if Bouwman’s concentric proposal is problematic, his focus on structural analysis is commendable. As noted, I shall argue that Rom 1:22–32, the indictment proper, possesses an *a–ba–ba–b* structure and that it is preceded by an introduction in 1:18–21. This leads me to the final anticipation. It relates to Bouwman’s claim that the passage begins at v. 21 as opposed to v. 22 (Klostermann–Jeremias) or v. 24 (Lyonnet). While I do not find this position convincing, Bouwman does draw attention to the importance of relating one’s analysis to the text that precedes, beginning at the very least with v. 18.

Reorienting the Structural Paradigm

Romans 1:18–21: Introduction to the Indictment

We begin our paradigm reorientation with Rom 1:18–21. The structural indicators for these verses are subtle. Rom 1:18a consists of a titular announcement concerning God’s heavenly wrath against *all* human ἀσέβεια (“impiety”) and ἀδικία (“unrighteousness”). The following verses concerning the manifest revelation of God in creation, which is clearly seen, being “intelligible” (νοέω) by what has been made (vv. 19–20), are then framed by virtually identical expressions: διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (“for what is known about God”) in v. 19a and διότι γινόντες τὸν θεόν (“for although they knew God”) in v. 21a.³⁴ That the rest of v. 21 belongs with what precedes rather than with what follows is suggested by the absence of a connecting particle between v. 21 and v. 22. Accordingly, this absence is not to be equated with asyndetic apposition, as argued by Lyonnet. The structural coherence of Rom 1:22–32 will substantiate this claim. Lastly, the knowledge of God, initially designated as the “truth” (ἀλήθεια), is what humans suppress in their unrighteousness (v. 18b), rendering them without excuse (v. 20b).

Although the structure of Rom 1:18–21 is subtle, its function is clear. This section establishes human culpability for suppressing the knowledge of God, a knowledge manifestly discernible in the works of creation. Rom 1:18–21 also prepares for the indictment proper by introducing prominent themes. The knowledge of God (vv. 19a, 21a) recurs explicitly in v. 28 (οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει [“they did not see fit to acknowledge God”]) and v. 32 (τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες [“although

³⁴ This parallel suggests that τὸ γνωστὸν in v. 19a should be translated as “what is known” in accordance with its usual meaning (cf. e.g. Exod 33:16; Acts 1:19), not “what can be known.”

they know the righteous requirement of God”]). Since the verb ματαιόω (“be/become vain”) and its cognate adjective μάταιος (“vain”) are often used in the Jewish scriptures to denote idolatry (e.g. 2 Kgs 17:15; Jer 2:5; 8:19), the occurrence of this verb in v. 21b (ἐματαιώθησαν [“they became vain”]) likely prepares for the later depiction of idolatry in vv. 23, 25.³⁵

The failure to glorify God (οὐχ ... θεὸν ἐδόξασαν), also in v. 21b, finds expression in v. 23 (ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ... [“they changed the glory of the incorruptible God...”]). The suppression of divine truth in v. 18b (τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ... κατεχόντων) recurs in v. 25 (μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ [“they exchanged the truth of God”]). The term ἀσύνετος (“senseless”) in v. 21b appears again at the beginning of v. 31. The darkened καρδία (“heart”) of v. 21b arguably parallels ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, the passions of the heart which lead to dishonorable bodily treatment and desires in vv. 24, 26–27. Finally, the coordinated concepts of ἀσέβεια (“impiety”) and ἀδικία (“unrighteousness”) in v. 18a find prominent expression, ἀσέβεια in vv. 22–23, 25, 28a, and ἀδικία in vv. 28b–32, and perhaps also vv. 24b, 26–27.³⁶

³⁵ The claim that in Rom 1:21 Paul is alluding to Jer 2:5 through the use of ματαιόω (e.g. Richard H. Bell, *No One Seeks for God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 1.18–3.20* [WUNT 106; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998], 130, n. 311) is almost certainly incorrect. This verb and its cognate adjective regularly occur in Second Temple Jewish exhortations of idolatry and immorality (cf. Wis 13:1; 15:8; *Let. Aris.* 134, 136, 138, 139; *Sib. Or.* 3.29). If there is an allusion in Rom 1:21, it is to Ps 94(93):11. Paul quotes this text in 1 Cor 3:20 in a context warning against the presumption of wisdom, the very matter addressed in Rom 1:22.

³⁶ ἀσέβεια shares its root with σεβάζομαι in v. 25 and ἀδικία is the first vice in the catalogue of vv. 29–31. Similarly, Peter Stuhlmacher (*Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* [trans. Scott J. Hafemann; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 306) identifies ἀσέβεια with vv. 21, 23, 25, 28 and ἀδικία with vv. 24, 26–27, 28–31.

Romans 1:22–32: *A–BA–BA–B* Structure for the Indictment Proper

Turning from the introduction of Rom 1:18–21 to the indictment proper in 1:22–32, it is important to emphasize that the structure delineated by focusing on the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”; vv. 23, 25, 26) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”; vv. 24, 26, 28) yields an *a–ba–ba–b* structure, not an *ab–ab–ab* structure. This is so for two reasons. First, an *ab–ab–ab* structure (vv. 22–24, 25–26a, 26b–32) would posit a break between vv. 24 and 25 and further imply that there should not be a break between vv. 25 and 26a. This division would then fall prey to the criticisms of Lyonnet, especially his doxology argument (cf. p. 294). Second, as we shall see, there is a particularly close relationship between the second *ba* segment of the structure (vv. 26–27) which would also be obscured. With this in mind, the *a–ba–ba–b* structure may be represented as follows:

Table 38. Greek Text of the *A–BA–BA–B* Structure of Rom 1:22–32

a1	²² φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν ²³ καὶ ἡλλάξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετῶν.		
b1	²⁴ Διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς.		
a2	²⁵ οἵτινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὃς ἐστὶν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν.		
b2	^{26a} Διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας,	a3	^{26b} αἱ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν, ²⁷ ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες.

<i>b3</i>	²⁸ Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, <u>παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς</u> εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, ²⁹ <u>πεπληρωμένους</u> πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου ἔριδος δόλου κακοηθείας, ψιθυριστὰς ³⁰ καταλάλους θεοστυγεῖς ὕβριστὰς ὑπερηφάνους ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ³¹ ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους ἀστόργους ἀνελεήμονας· ³² οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσὶν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν.
-----------	--

Table 39. English Translation of the *A–BA–BA–B* Structure of Rom 1:22–32

<i>a1</i>	²² Professing to be wise, they became fools ²³ and <u>changed</u> the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of a corruptible human and of birds and of four-footed animals and of serpents.		
<i>b1</i>	²⁴ Therefore <u>God gave them over to the desires</u> of their hearts for impurity, to dishonor their bodies among themselves:		
<i>a2</i>	²⁵ Who <u>exchanged</u> the truth of God for falsehood and worshiped and served creation rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever, amen.		
<i>b2</i>	^{26a} On account of this, <u>God gave them over to</u> passions of dishonor ,	<i>a3</i>	^{26b} for both their women <u>exchanged</u> the natural function for that which is contrary to nature, ²⁷ and likewise also men, leaving the natural function of the woman, burned in their longing for each other, men with men committing the shameful deed and reaping the recompense, which was necessary, of their deceit in themselves.
<i>b3</i>	²⁸ And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God, <u>God gave them over to an unfit</u> mind, to do improper things, ²⁹ filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, guile, malice; gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, God-haters, insolent, haughty, braggards, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents; senseless, faithless, loveless, merciless: ³² who although they know the righteous requirement of God that those practicing such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same but also applaud those practicing.		

The verb ἀλλάσσω (“change”), as opposed to μεταλλάσσω (“exchange”) in vv. 25, 26b, distinguishes section *a1* as the initial idolatrous “change.” Although initiatory, this idolatrous act is recapitulated in *a2* (the reason I have placed both in bold). More immediately, however, the initial idolatrous change in *a1* gives rise to the first “giving-over” in *b1*. This first giving-over to desires which lead to dishonorable bodily treatment

(ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ... τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι) finds a parallel in the second giving-over in *b2* to dishonoring passions (εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας). In other words, just as *a2* recapitulates *a1* so also *b2* recapitulates *b1*. Based upon this pattern, one would expect *a3* to recapitulate *a1* and *a2*. Instead, however, the giving-over of *b2* and the exchange of *a3* merge into one another and clarify the precise nature of the dishonorable desires: same sex acts among both women and men. The effect of this conflation of the (ex)change/giving-over pattern is also to suggest that idolatry ultimately creates a vortex in which acts become indistinguishable from consequences.

Following the merging of the giving-over and exchange into one another is the broadening out of the third giving-over in *b3*. The protasis of v. 28a, which gives rise to the corresponding apodosis of v. 28b expressed in a word-play (οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν [“they did not see fit”] and ἀδόκιμον [“unfit”]), is necessary because the exchange of *a3* did not, as the first two, narrate a ground for giving-over humanity. The point of this last giving-over is to suggest that the initial idolatrous change of v. 23 leads not just to disordered sexual desires but to the myriad of vices that plague society and also to a defiant attitude toward God manifested in the approval of those who flout God’s decree, an approval given by those who do the same. Finally, given the close association between wisdom and knowledge elsewhere in the Pauline corpus (cf. Rom 11:33; 1 Cor 12:8; Eph 1:17; Col 1:9; 2:3), it may be significant that v. 22, following the emphasis on the knowledge of God in vv. 18–21, begins by depicting humanity’s false wisdom and vv. 28, 32 conclude by portraying humanity’s false knowledge. This could allude to the cyclical nature of sin. In other words, by ending the indictment in a manner similar to its

beginning, the idea might be to communicate that this morally degenerative process has the potential to start all over again, with even more disastrous results.

Romans 2:1–4: Inferential Incorporation of an Unidentified Interlocutor

Turning from the disastrous results of idolatry, Paul suddenly indicts an interlocutor for hypocrisy. This indictment, however, must not be disconnected from the preceding excoriation. In that sense, Bassler is absolutely correct (cf. p. 290). There are several important links between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1 ff. The Διό (“Therefore”) of 2:1 is most naturally interpreted in light of the Διό in 1:24 and the synonymous expression Διὰ τοῦτο (“On account of this”) in 1:26. The term ἀναπολόγητος (“without excuse”) in 2:1 also occurs in 1:20. These are the only two places in the NT in which this term appears. The next link is conceptual: 1:32 portrays persons who *approve* of those who do the same things as they themselves do; and 2:1 follows this by portraying a person who *disapproves* of those who do the same things as he himself does. This leads to the last link: 1:28, 32 and 2:1–3, as Bassler has observed, alternate between using the verbs ποιέω (“do”) and πράσσω (“practice”) in relation to τὰ αὐτά (“the same things”) and τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”). Tables 40 and 41 show how striking the connections are in this regard:

Table 40. Greek Text of Rom 1:28, 32 and 2:1–3

Rom 1:28, 32	²⁸ Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα... ³² οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες ὅτι οἱ <u>τὰ τοιαῦτα</u> πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, οὐ μόνον <u>αὐτὰ</u> ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν .
Rom 2:1–3	¹ Διὸ ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὃ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις, <u>τὰ</u> γὰρ <u>αὐτὰ</u> πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων. ² οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς <u>τὰ τοιαῦτα</u> πράσσοντας . ³ λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο, ὃ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς <u>τὰ τοιαῦτα</u> πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν <u>αὐτά</u> , ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ;

Table 41. English Translation of Rom 1:28, 32 and 2:1–3

Rom 1:28, 32	²⁸ And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them over to an unfit mind, to do improper things.... ³² who although they know the righteous requirement of God that those practicing such things are worthy of death, they not only do the <u>same</u> but also applaud those practicing .
Rom 2:1–3	¹ Therefore, you are without excuse, O human, every person who judges: for when you judge another, you condemn yourself, for the one judging practices the same . ² But we know that the judgment of God is, in accordance with truth, upon those practicing such things . ³ But consider this, O human, the one judging those practicing such things and doing the same , will you escape the judgment of God?

In view of these links between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–3, we may align the first two of the four pavement stones identified in chapter one and discussed at length in chapter two. Pavement stone one, the problematic particle Διό, emerges as clearly inferential and should consequently be translated “Therefore.” As for pavement stone two, when the *a–ba–ba–b* structure of Rom 1:22–32 and alternation between ποιέω (“do”) and πράσσω (“practice”) in relation to τὰ αὐτά (“the same things”) and τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) are kept in mind, the similarity is not uncertain at all. The “same things” of which the interlocutor is guilty are, in the first instance, the vices of Rom 1:29–31. Yet, these vices are, in turn, part of the sin–retribution sequence of 1:22–32 and have their origin in the initial idolatrous change of 1:23. Thus, especially through the inferential Διό and repeated charge of doing the same, the interlocutor is being indicted for idolatrous conduct, exacerbated by his own hypocritical judgment.

In terms of establishing the identity of this unidentified interlocutor (pavement stone three), it will prove significant that the initial idolatrous change of Rom 1:23 is articulated utilizing language drawn from Ps 106(105):20, part of a passage (vv. 19–23)

concerning *Israel*'s idolatry with the golden calf, and that the “giving-over” (παρέδωκεν) portion of the sin–retribution pattern also derives from Ps 106(105):41a, a verse concerning God's response to the Gentile-like behavior of *Israel* chronicled in Ps 106(105):34–40, behavior that includes idolatry and sexual immorality. These intertextual hints of the interlocutor's Jewish identity will be discussed further in the substructural analysis section (cf. esp. p. 349).

As for Rom 2:4, ἡ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει, (“Or do you despise the wealth of his kindness and forbearance and patience, unaware that the kindness of God leads you to repentance?”), this verse, as I shall discuss in the surface analysis section, subversively engages traditional Jewish viewpoints reflected in Wis 15:1–2 (cf. p. 355). In fact, as I shall show in chapter six, the text from Wisdom is itself an implicit interpretation of the golden calf incident (cf. Exod 34:6–7, 9) and is one of several indications that Paul's decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, a particular conversation about differing understandings of Jewish identity, involving Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106). For now, however, our focus remains on structural analysis and we turn to Rom 2:5–11.

Romans 2:5–11: Elaborate Chiasm on Divine Judgment for Jew First

Continuing the indictment that began in 2:1, Rom 2:5 is a scripturally-evocative portrayal of the interlocutor. He is described as possessing a “hard” (σκληρότης) and unrepentant “heart” (καρδία) on account of which this interlocutor is accumulating wrath

against himself on the day of wrath and revelation of God's righteous judgment (cf. Deut 9:27; 10:16; Tob 4:8–10). Linked by the relative pronoun ὅς (“who”), which takes its subject from and thus is dependent on the preceding reference to the righteous judgment of God,³⁷ vv. 6–11 constitute an elaborate double-chiasm on divine judgment, one in which *both* the order of reward and punishment *and* the depiction of human action and the results of that action mirror one another. This understanding of Rom 2:6–11 requires appreciating the extent as well as the nature of the dual chiastic form that Paul's argument takes, including how his references to punishment and reward for the Jew first, intrude upon that form and thus serves as an important clue to the interlocutor's identity. To arrive at this understanding of Rom 2:6–11, the present subsection briefly discusses: two early approximations of the chiastic form in Rom 2:7–10; an extension of the chiasm to include vv. 6, 11, which brings into focus the structural significance of the intrusive statements concerning Jewish priority in punishment and reward; and finally apprehension of the dual nature of the chiastic form in which vv. 6–11 have been cast. In the end, we shall see that careful attention to this intricate chiastic form directs us back to Rom 1:23, underscoring the Jewish identity of the interlocutor in the process.

Early Approximations: J. Weiss (1897) and J. Jeremias (1958)

The chiastic form of Rom 2:7–10 has long been recognized. An early approximation may be found in the 1897 essay “Contributions to Pauline Rhetoric” by Johannes Weiss. He describes the manner in which these verses attach to the preceding

³⁷ Eberhard Jüngel (“Das Gesetz zwischen Adam und Christus: Eine theologische Studie zu Röm 5, 12–21,” *ZTK* 60 [1963]: 42–74[70]) rightly draws attention to the dependence of v. 6 on v. 5: “V. 6 ist seinerseits von V. 5 abhängig, der die Rede vom eschatologischen Gericht Gottes negativ motiviert.”

statement about judgment according to works as “a splendid antithesis with chiasmic placement of its members.”³⁸ Weiss, however, does not elaborate any further on the nature of this chiasm and from the analytical outline he provides it is difficult to tell exactly how he conceived of the chiasmic interrelationship among its members.

Approximately sixty years later, Joachim Jeremias offered a closer approximation of this chiasmic form in his 1958 article “*Chiasmus* in the Pauline Letters.”³⁹ Having discussed the chiasmic combination of sentence-sequence and word-placement in Rom 10:9–10, Jeremias turns to what he regards as an analogous arrangement in Rom 2:7–10 and presents the following diagram:

- a** ⁷ τοῖς μὲν ... δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον,
b ⁸ τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας ... ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός.
b' ⁹ θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ
κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος·
a' ¹⁰ δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν,
Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι·
- a** ⁷ to those who ... seek glory and honor and incorruptibility, eternal life,
b ⁸ but to those who from selfish ambition ... wrath and fury.
b' ⁹ Affliction and distress upon every soul of a person who does evil,
of the Jew first and of the Greek:
a' ¹⁰ but glory and honor and peace to everyone who does good,
to the Jew first and to the Greek.

³⁸ “... in einer trefflichen Antithese mit chiastischer Stellung der Glieder...,” “Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik,” in *Theologischen Studien. Herrn Wirkl. Oberkonsistorialrath Professor D. Bernhard Weiss zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht* (ed. C. R. Gregory, et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 165–247[178].

³⁹ Joachim Jeremias, “Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen,” *ZNW* 49 (1958): 145–56[148]. See also Jüngel, “Gesetz,” 70.

In commenting on his diagram, Jeremias first observes that the sentence-sequence for these four verses is Reward/Punishment (vv. 7–8) but then Punishment/Reward (vv. 9–10). Additionally, the underlining highlights the alternation in word-placement: for vv. 7–8 the terms conveying reward and punishment are at the end, while for vv. 9–10 the words for punishment and reward are at the beginning.

Undoubtedly, Jeremias's analysis represents a step forward compared to that of Weiss and, in so far his observations go, they are unobjectionable.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, Jeremias's understanding of the chiastic form embedded in Rom 2:5–11 suffers from three difficulties. First, his decision to omit (indicated by ellipses) the phrases καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ ("by patience of good work") and καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ ("and disobedience to the truth but obedience to unrighteousness"), from vv. 7, 8 respectively, obscures the manner in which what he identifies merely as alternation in word-placement actually participates in a broader chiastic interrelationship between the depiction of human action and the results of that action. We shall return to this point. Second, Jeremias fails to perceive that the chiasm ought to be extended to include vv. 6, 11. Third, had Jeremias extended the chiasm he would have likely seen that the statements concerning Jewish priority in punishment as well as reward are not part of the chiastic form but rather intrude upon that form, providing an important clue to the identity of the interlocutor.

⁴⁰ The influence of Jeremias's analysis may be discerned in Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT 6.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1978), 1:126; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 78; N. T. Wright, "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 10 (ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 439.

Extension and Intrusion: K. Grobel (1964)

The last two difficulties mentioned in the critique of Jeremias do not figure into the pre-Pauline proposal of Kendrick Grobel. Extending the chiasm to include the “two complementary statements” of vv. 6, 11, Grobel suggests that Paul added his own “footnotes” to the following inherited form:⁴¹

- A** ⁶ ὅς [θεός]
- B** ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ·
- C** ⁷ τοῖς μέν ... δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν
- D** ζητοῦσιν
- E** ζωὴν αἰώνιον,
- F** ⁸ τοῖς δέ ... πειθομένοις ... τῇ ἀδικίᾳ
- G** ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός.
- G'** ⁹ θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία
- F'** ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν....
- E'** ¹⁰ δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ [καὶ εἰρήνη]
- D'** παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ
- C'** τὸ ἀγαθόν....
- B'** ¹¹ οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία
- A'** παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.
- A** ⁶ who [God]
- B** will repay each person according to his works:
- C** ⁷ to those, who ... glory and honor and incorruptibility
- D** seek,

⁴¹ “A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2,” in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultman zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. Erich Dinkler; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964), 255–61[257]. Grobel’s original diagram lacks παντί from **D'**. Since Grobel neither indicates the omission nor comments on it later in the essay, it would seem that the omission was unintentional. Accordingly, I have included παντί.

E eternal life;
F ⁸ but to those who are ... obedient ... to unrighteousness
G wrath and fury.
G' ⁹ Affliction and distress
F' upon every soul of a person who does evil....
E' ¹⁰ but glory and honor [and peace]
D' to everyone who does
C' good....
B' ¹¹ For there is no partiality
A' with God.

Grobel brackets καὶ εἰρήνη (“and peace”) of **E'** because he views this phrase as a possible pre-Pauline accretion. He speculates that ἀφθαρσίαν (“incorruptibility”) of **C** originally belonged with ζῶν αἰώνιον (“eternal life”) of **E**. In crossing the linguistic boundary from the Hebrew original to a Greek translation, however, ἀφθαρσίαν became associated with δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν (“glory and honor”) of **C**, turning a two-noun pattern into a three-noun pattern. Subsequently, καὶ εἰρήνη was added to δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ of **E'** to create another three-noun pattern.⁴²

As for the “footnotes” added by Paul himself, these may have included ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (“from selfish ambition and disobedience to the truth”) in v. 8, or **F**, although this addition could also have been pre-Pauline.⁴³ A more likely Pauline addition is καθ’ ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ (“by perseverance of good work”) in v. 7, or **C**. Finally, the nearly identical Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος (“of the Jew first

⁴² Grobel, “Chiastic,” 259.

⁴³ On the debate surrounding the meaning of ἐριθεία, see the discussions in Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 86–87; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 138, n. 14.

and of the Greek”) in v. 9c, or F', and Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι (“to the Jew first and to the Greek”) in v. 10c, or C', “are certainly Paul’s.”⁴⁴ Indeed, Grobel even claims:

By means of them he [Paul] is adapting the originally purely Jewish statement of the doctrine of retribution to the use he makes of it in Romans between chapters 1 and 3: this does indeed, he is saying, apply first of all (πρῶτον) to the Jew, but not exclusively to him, as you may particularistically think whenever you hear this statement recited; yes, the Jew is ahead – in being punished! Only after recognizing that terrible priority may you rejoice in your priority for the reward; but here, too, not merely in the former case, the Gentile is on your heels.⁴⁵

Although this interpretive gloss could leave the misleading impression that Paul himself was not Jewish, Grobel accurately captures the *structural significance* of the intrusive statements concerning priority in punishment and reward: they point in the direction of a fellow Jewish interlocutor. One could, of course, argue that the statements look forward to 2:17, rather than backward to 2:1.⁴⁶ These statements, however, are only one of a number of indications that the unidentified interlocutor whom Paul suddenly opposes is a fellow Jew. I shall discuss one more indication later in the present subsection and the others in the substructural and surface analysis sections to follow.

In terms of influence, Grobel’s proposal seems to have had the effect, even if indirect, of causing many scholars to extend the chiasm to include vv. 6, 11.⁴⁷ His

⁴⁴ Grobel, “Chiastic,” 258. This claim has convinced Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 124.

⁴⁵ Grobel, “Chiastic,” 258, material in brackets mine.

⁴⁶ So, for example, Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 111–12.

⁴⁷ The following scholars extend the chiasm to include vv. 6, 11: Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 59; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 302–3; Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 39; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP 6; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996), 82; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 135–36; Leander E. Keck, *Romans* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2005), 76–77; Jewett, *Romans*, 194.

reconstruction of the pre-Pauline form, however, has proven less persuasive.⁴⁸ Two reasons likely account for this lack of persuasion. First, reconstruction of pre-Pauline forms is an inherently speculative and therefore questionable endeavor. Consider Grobel's assessment of ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ("from selfish ambition and disobedience to the truth") in v. 8, or F, as an example. He initially identifies ἀπειθέω ("disobey") of 2:8 as a Pauline term, albeit one confined to Romans (cf. 10:21; 11:30, 31; 15:31). Yet, Grobel subsequently opines that the phrase ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ("they disobey the truth") "sounds more Johannine (cf. Jn 3, 21; 1 Jn 1, 6) or *alttestamentlich* ... than Pauline" and concludes rather tentatively: "Perhaps, then, it was a distorting pre-Pauline addition."⁴⁹ One could easily argue that the prevalence of ἀπειθέω in Romans should have led Grobel to the opposite conclusion.

Second, the attempt to identify and excise accretions in order to restore a pure form sometimes leads one to neglect the function of supposed accretions in the present form of the text. Thus Grobel regards "καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ ["by perseverance of good work"; v. 7] as a probable >footnote< of Paul inserted by him to point up the implications that he found in ζητοῦσιν (>strive after<),⁵⁰ even though this excision actually decreases the parallelism highlighted in his own chiastic outline between vv. 7 and 10 (or C and C'), since ἀγαθός ("good") recurs in the latter. Although one could

⁴⁸ It is explicitly rejected, for example, by Dunn (*Romans* 1–8, 78) and Schreiner (*Romans* [Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998], 111–12). Although Bassler (*Divine Impartiality*, 124, 199) offers a positive assessment, her own ring-structure proposal for Rom 1:16–2:10 draws attention away from the supposed pre-Pauline chiasm preserved in 2:6–11.

⁴⁹ "Chiastic," 258.

⁵⁰ "Chiastic," 258, this quotation and the following one with material in brackets mine.

propose, in support of Grobel's position, that Paul inserted καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ into v. 7 precisely to foster such parallelism with v. 10, Grobel himself argues that "Paul was either unaware of the form of what he was quoting or that he had no interest in keeping its form intact...." Thus, in Grobel's view, Paul, if anything, detracted from the form.

It seems best, then, to adopt Grobel's extension of the chiasm to include vv. 6, 11 and his emphasis on the *structural significance* of Jewish priority,⁵¹ but to reject his attempt to reconstruct the pre-Pauline form. In fact, concentration on the present text leads to the recognition that Grobel's diagram, in part through its omission of καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, neglects the manner in which vv. 7–10 participate in a double-chiasm concerning *both* the order of reward and punishment *and* the depiction of human action and the results of that action.

Apprehending the Double-Chiasm: P. J. Achtemeier (1990)

As far as I am aware, the first scholar to discern the double-chiasm in Rom 2:7–10 concerning *both* the order of reward and punishment *and* the depiction of human action and the results of that action is Paul J. Achtemeier in an article published in 1990.⁵² Since Achtemeier's article focuses on the structure and argument of Rom 3:1–8 and his observation regarding the double-chiasm 2:7–10 is relegated to a footnote, his analysis

⁵¹ Although Schreiner (*Romans*, 111) objects to such an extension because, technically speaking, "God's impartiality is the reason he judges each person with respect to his or her works," the relationship between the notions of equitable and impartial judgment in vv. 6, 11 is nevertheless close enough to justify placing these two ideas in chiastic parallel with one another.

⁵² "Romans 3:1–8: Structure and Argument," *ATHR Supplementary Series* 11 (1990): 77–87[83, n. 32]. See also Bell, *No One Seeks for God*, 141.

appears to have been overlooked.⁵³ Nevertheless, Achtemeier's brief comments on 2:7–10 prove remarkably insightful. Incorporating these comments into the extended chiasm, which allows for recognition of the intrusive presence of the statements concerning Jewish priority in punishment and reward, the elaborate structure of Rom 2:6–11 may be represented as follows:

- A** Equitable Judgment: ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· (v. 6)
- B** Reward: **Action:** τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσιν (v. 7a)
Result: ζωὴν αἰώνιον, (v. 7b)
- C** Punishment: **Action:** τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ (v. 8a)
Result: ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός. (v. 8b)
- C'** Punishment: *Result:* θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία (v. 9a)
Action: ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, (v. 9b)
Jew and Greek: Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλλήνος· (v. 9c)
- B'** Reward: *Result:* δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη (v. 10a)
Action: παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, (v. 10b)
Jew and Greek: Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι· (v. 10c)
- A'** Impartial Judgment: οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ. (v. 11)
- A** Equitable Judgment: “Who will repay each person according to his works” (v. 6)
- B** Reward: **Action:** “To those who by perseverance of good work seek glory and honor and incorruptibility” (v. 7a)
Result: “Eternal life” (v. 7b)

⁵³ Achtemeier's analysis is not mentioned, for example, in the subsequent commentaries by Fitzmyer (*Romans*, 296–305) and Jewett (*Romans*, 194).

- C** Punishment: **Action:** “To those who from selfish ambition and disobedience to the truth but obedience to unrighteousness” (v. 8a)
Result: “Wrath and fury” (v. 8b)
- C'** Punishment: *Result:* “Affliction and distress” (v. 9a)
Action: “Upon every soul of a person who does evil” (v. 9b)
Jew and Greek: “Of the Jew first and of the Greek” (v. 9c)
- B'** Reward: *Result:* “Glory and honor and peace” (v. 10a)
Action: “To everyone who does good” (v. 10b)
Jew and Greek: “To the Jew first and to the Greek” (v. 10c)
- A'** Impartial Judgment: “For there is no partiality with God” (v. 11)

Besides showing how the emphasis on Jewish priority in punishment and reward (vv. 9c, 10c) intrudes upon the parallelism in the second half of the structure, the outline above illustrates the interrelationship of the double-chiasm. This is especially evident in the **B'** depiction of Reward (v. 10a,b). On the one hand, **B'** Reward contrasts with **C'** Punishment (v. 9a,b), as reflected in their respective portrayals of **Action**, which share the adjective *πᾶς* (“all”) as well as employ cognate verbs (*κατεργάζομαι/ἐργάζομαι* [“produce”/“work”]) and a stereotyped pair of antonyms (*κακός/ἀγαθός* [“evil”/“good”]).⁵⁴ On the other hand, **B'** Reward (v. 10a,b) parallels **B** Reward (v. 7a). The terms *δόξα* (“glory”), *τιμή* (“honor”), and *ἀγαθός* (“good”) in the *Result* and **Action** segments of **B'** Reward all occur in the **Action** segment of **B** Reward.

This parallelism between **B** and **B'**, in fact, provides further evidence for the structural significance of Rom 1:23 and perhaps another clue to the interlocutor’s identity

⁵⁴ For the stereotyped pairing of *ἀγαθός* and *κακός*, cf. e.g. Num 14:23; 32:11; Deut 1:39.

as well. Recalling that the double-chiasm of Rom 2:6–11 grammatically depends on v. 5 and, in turn, continues the indictment that began at 2:1, it is important to note that of the four terms used to depict the goal and gift of right conduct, δόξα (“glory”), τιμή (“honor”), ἀφθαρσία (“incorruptibility”), and εἰρήνη (“peace”), the first three may be related to or found in Rom 1:23. Beginning with τιμή, although neither this term nor one of its cognates appear in Rom 1:23, the notion of dishonorable bodily treatment and desires (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι ... πάθη ἀτιμίας) is prominent in Rom 1:24, 26, perhaps implying a prior forfeiture of honor in Rom 1:23. As for δόξα and ἀφθαρσία, the change of Rom 1:23 involves τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ (“the **glory** of the **incorruptible** God for the likeness of a **corruptible** image”), whether of a human or animals. Thus, in the interest of indicting the hypocritical, hard-hearted, and unrepentant interlocutor of Rom 2:1 ff., salvation is essentially depicted in 2:7a, 10a as a pursuit and recovery of what was lost in Rom 1:23. In addition to the intrusive statements about Jewish priority in punishment and reward (2:9c, 10c), another clue to the interlocutor’s Jewish identity emerges from the recognition that the key term δόξα in Rom 1:23 derives from Ps 106(105):20, itself part of a text concerning Israel’s idolatry with the golden calf. We turn now to consider this scriptural evocation in Rom 1:23, including the manner in which it is conflated with Gen 1:20–27, and then is reinforced by two subsequent evocations of Ps 106(105).

Substructural Analysis

The preceding section analyzed the structure of Rom 1:18–2:11 in three parts: 1:18–32; 2:1–4; and 2:5–11. Calling for a paradigm reorientation in regard to scholarly

analyses of Rom 1:18–32, I argued that following the introduction of 1:18–21, the indictment proper of 1:22–32 is characterized by a sin–retribution sequence based upon the triadic interplay between (μετ)ῆλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”; vv. 23, 25, 26b) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”; vv. 24, 26a, 28), yielding an *a–ba–ba–b* structure. Through an inferential Διό (“Therefore”) (pavement stone one) and the charge of doing/practicing τά ... αὐτά (“the same things) or τα τοιαῦτα (“such things”) (pavement stone two), Rom 2:1–4 then incorporates an unidentified interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence. Finally, Rom 2:5–11 continues the indictment of this interlocutor, culminating in an elaborate double-chiasm concerning divine judgment, one that hints at the Jewish identity of the interlocutor (pavement stone three) and even directs our attention back to Rom 1:23.

The present section examines the scriptural allusions underlying the structural hinges of Paul’s argumentation, specifically the conflated evocations of Ps 106(105):20 and Gen 1:20–27 in Rom 1:23; the punitive use of Ps 106(105):41a in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28; and the indirect employment of Ps 106(105):23a,d in Rom 2:5–11, by means of a multifaceted allusion to Deut 9–10. Since each evocation considered either draws from or arguably was inspired by Ps 106(105), this psalm may be regarded as constituting the substructure of Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11. Moreover, these evocations provide conclusive corroboration for identifying the interlocutor of Rom 2:1ff. as a Jew.

Calf and Creation in Romans 1:23: Psalm 106(105):20 and Genesis 1:20–27

Two sets of scriptural texts have often been associated with Rom 1:23, one belonging to the change of glory imagery in the first half of the verse and the other to the idol imagery in the second half. We begin the former. The first set of texts associated with Rom 1:23 consists of Ps 106(105):20 and Jer 2:11.

Table 42. Jer 2:11; Ps 106(105):20; and Rom 1:23

Jer 2:11	Ps 106(105):20	Rom 1:23
¹¹ εἰ ἀλλάσσονται ἔθνη θεοὺς αὐτῶν; καὶ οὗτοι οὐκ εἰσιν θεοί. ὁ δὲ λαός μου ἠλλάξατο τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ἐξ ἧς οὐκ ὠφελήθησονται.	²⁰ καὶ ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον.	²³ καὶ ἠλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἐρπετῶν.
¹¹ If nations will change their gods? But these are not gods. Yet my people changed their glory , from which they will not profit.	²⁰ And they changed their glory for the likeness of a calf which eats grass.	²³ And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of a corruptible human being and of birds and of four-footed animals and of serpents.

As the table above shows, the verbal parallels with Ps 106(105):20 are more extensive than those with Jer 2:11, a fact that has led scholars to stress the influence of the former rather than the latter in Rom 1:23.⁵⁵ Moreover, from the review of literature in chapter two, we have seen that the association of Rom 1:23 with Ps 106(105):20 extends even to the manuscript tradition of both texts. Although Emma Wasserman objects to discerning such an allusion since “Ps 106 discusses the Israelites’ glory, not God’s

⁵⁵ According to John R. Levison (“Adam and Eve in Romans 1.18–25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*,” *NTS* 50 [2004]: 519–34[523, n. 18]), for example, the allusion to Jer 2:11 “would certainly appear to be secondary in comparison with Ps 105.20 LXX.” Against the claim that Rom 1:21 evokes Jer 2:5, which could be utilized in support of discerning an allusion to Jer 2:11 in Rom 1:23, cf. n. 35.

glory,”⁵⁶ this objection fails to account for the interplay between the literal and metaphorical meaning of “their glory” in Ps 106:20, referring to the Israelites’ loss of earrings/robes and divine presence respectively (cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6). That Paul chose to stress the metaphorical aspect of what Israel lost (God’s glory) hardly negates the allusion.⁵⁷

What is significant, however, is that the words in Ps 106(105):20 referring to the golden calf (μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον) are omitted from Rom 1:23 and replaced by human and animal imagery connected to idolatry. This brings us to the second set of texts: Gen 1:20–27 and Deut 4:15–18.

Table 43. Gen 1:20–27 and Deut 4:15–18

Gen 1:20–27	Deut 4:15–18
<p>²⁰ Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ἐξαγαγέτω τὰ ὕδατα ἔρπετὰ ψυχῶν ζωσῶν καὶ πετεινὰ πετόμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατὰ τὸ στερέωμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. ²¹ καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ κήτη τὰ μεγάλα καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζῶων ἔρπετῶν, ἃ ἐξήγαγεν τὰ ὕδατα κατὰ γένη αὐτῶν, καὶ πᾶν πετεινὸν πτερωτὸν κατὰ γένος. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὰ. ²² καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς λέγων Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὰ ὕδατα ἐν ταῖς θαλάσσαις, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ πληθυνέσθωσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ²³ καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωΐ, ἡμέρα πέμπτη.</p> <p>²⁴ Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν κατὰ γένος, τετράποδα καὶ ἔρπετὰ καὶ θηρία τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως. ²⁵ καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος καὶ τὰ κτήνη κατὰ γένος καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔρπετὰ τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλὰ. ²⁶ καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν, καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς</p>	<p>¹⁵ καὶ φυλάξεσθε σφόδρα τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, ὅτι οὐκ εἶδετε ὁμοίωμα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἣ ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν Χωρήβ ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρός. ¹⁶ μὴ ἀνομήσητε καὶ ποιήσητε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς γλυπτὸν ὁμοίωμα, πᾶσαν εἰκόνα, ὁμοίωμα ἀρσενικοῦ ἢ θηλυκοῦ, ¹⁷ ὁμοίωμα παντὸς κτήνους τῶν ὄντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὁμοίωμα παντὸς ὀρνέου πτερωτοῦ, ὃ πέταται ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, ¹⁸ ὁμοίωμα</p>

⁵⁶ *Death of the Soul in Romans* 7, 119–20, n. 2.

⁵⁷ Similarly, Cranfield (*Epistle to the Romans*, 1:119 [material in brackets mine]) states, “Paul uses δόξα here [Rom 1:23] differently from the way in which it is used in the psalm-verse ... but the substantial meaning is much the same, since what is meant by Israel’s glory is God Himself.”

<p>θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ²⁷ καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.</p>	<p>παντὸς ἐρπετοῦ ὃ ἔρπει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὁμοίωμα παντὸς ἰχθύος, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς.</p>
<p>²⁰ And God said, “Let the waters bring forth serpents among the living creatures and winged birds upon the land against the firmament of the sky.” And it became so. ²¹ And God made the great sea monsters and every living creature of the serpents, which the waters brought forth according to kind, and every winged bird according to kind. And God saw that they were good. ²² And God blessed them, saying “Increase and be multiplied and fill the waters in the seas, let the birds be multiplied upon the land. ²³ And evening came and morning came, the fifth day. ²⁴ And God said, “Let the land bring forth the living creature according to kind, four-footed animals and serpents and beasts of the land according to kind.” And it became so. ²⁵ And God made the beasts of the land according to kind and the cattle according to kind and all the serpents of the land according to their kind. And God saw that they were good. ²⁶ And God said, “Let us make humankind in our image and according to <i>likeness</i>, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the land and over all the serpents slithering upon the land. ²⁷ And God made humankind, according to God’s image he made it, male and female he made them.</p>	<p>¹⁵ And guard your souls greatly, because you did not see a likeness on the day in which the LORD spoke to you at Horeb on the mountain from the midst of the fire. ¹⁶ Do not act lawlessly and make for yourselves an engraved likeness, any image—a likeness of male or female, ¹⁷ a likeness of any animal among those upon the land, a likeness of any winged bird, which flies under the sky, ¹⁸ a likeness of any serpent which slithers upon the land, a likeness of any fish, as much as are in the waters under the land.</p>

The bold terms also occur in Rom 1:23 (cf. table 42 on p. 319). As should be apparent, the parallels with Gen 1:20–27 are greater than those with Deut 4:15–18, especially since the one verbal parallel present in the latter but absent in the former, *ὁμοίωμα* (“likeness”),⁵⁸ derives from Ps 106(105):20. This parallelism between Gen 1:20–27 and the second half of Rom 1:23 was noted independently by Niels Hyldahl in

⁵⁸ Note, however, *ὁμοίωσις* in Gen 1:26, which I have italicized in table 43.

1956 and Jacob Jervell in 1960.⁵⁹ Both scholars point to Paul's preservation of the sequence of animals, although in a slightly different manner. Hyldahl observes that the same order of birds, four-footed land animals, and serpents appear in Gen 1:20–24, if one omits the water animals created on the fifth day, while Jervell concentrates on Gen 1:26 and finds the same sequence by equating κτηνῶν (“cattle”) with τετραπόδων (“four-footed animals”).⁶⁰ Hyldahl and Jervell differ, however, in their interpretation of the parallelism between Gen 1:20–27 and Rom 1:23. According to Hyldahl, Paul draws upon the language of Gen 1 because he discerns in idolatry an inversion of the created order (cf. Rom 1:25). Jervell, in contrast, identifies the εἰκόνοϛ φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου (“image of a corruptible human”) in Rom 1:23 with Adam, or ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆϛ χοϊκός (“the first man from the dust”) whose image Paul says fallen humanity bears in 1 Cor 15:45–49 (cf. Gen 2:7).⁶¹ Although he regards the corruptible/mortal nature of Adamic humanity in Paul as the fruit of sin, Jervell does not think that Rom 1:23 explains “how it has come about that we have become like Adam instead of like God” and he further states: “Only so much is to be inferred from Rom 1:18ff.: We ourselves are to blame

⁵⁹ Niels Hyldahl (“A Reminiscence of the Old Testament at Romans i. 23,” *NTS* 2 [1956]: 285–88[286, n. 2, material in brackets mine]), “I must admit that it is only to the best of my knowledge that nobody before me has drawn this fourth text [Gen 1:20ff.] into discussion...”; Jacob Jervell (*Imago Dei. Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* [FRLANT 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 312–36[320]), “Bisher hat — soweit es mir bekannt ist — kein Ausleger auf den Zusammenhang mit LXX Gen 1,26f. hingewiesen.”

⁶⁰ Hyldahl, “Reminiscence,” 286–87; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 320. In commenting of the sequence of animals, Hyldahl includes Gen 1:25 but this verse is not necessary to make his point. Hyldahl also notes that in Gen 1:20–27 and Rom 1:23 animal terminology is plural whereas human terminology is singular.

⁶¹ Jervell (*Imago Dei*, 323) notes φθορά in 1 Cor 15:42, 50; and φθαρτός in 1 Cor 15:53, 54.

because we have not properly applied the knowledge of God.”⁶² Thus for Jervell neither Rom 1:23 itself nor 1:18–32 considered as a whole recounts the Adamic fall.

Adamic Fall

Drawing upon the earlier article of Hyldahl, but not the contemporaneous monograph of Jervell, Morna Hooker in 1960 took the additional step of arguing for a subtle rehearsal of the Adamic fall in Rom 1, based primarily upon shared language and sequence.⁶³ Significantly, her argument was also influenced by the assumption of an Adam myth. More recently, John R. Levison has advocated a similar approach.⁶⁴ Yet, his reading is distinct from that of Hooker. Having undermined Hooker’s assumption of an Adam myth in an earlier monograph, Levison looks to the interpretive expansions in the *Apocalypse of Moses*, or Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* (the designation Levison prefers) as the hermeneutical key to discerning the Adamic fall in Rom 1:18–25.⁶⁵ Since these views, especially that of Hooker, have become quite influential and could be cited as an objection to my primary proposal that Rom 1:18–2:11 is built upon the substructure of Ps 106(105), they require discussion.⁶⁶

⁶² The broader context from which these quotes derive is “Paulus erklärt nicht in Röm 1,23, wie es geschehen ist, daß wir Adamgleich anstatt Gottgleich geworden sind. Ebensowenig wie er erklärt, warum wir den alten Menschen tragen. Nur soviel ist aus Röm 1,18ff. zu entnehmen: Wir sind selbst daran schuld, weil wir die Gotteserkenntnis nicht richtig verwendet haben.” See Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 324.

⁶³ “Adam in Romans 1,” *NTS* 6: 297–306.

⁶⁴ “Greek *Life*,” 519–34.

⁶⁵ With Levison (“Greek *Life*,” 519, n. 2), I shall refer to the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* and utilize the related abbreviation “*GLAE*,” as opposed to *Apocalypse of Moses* and “*Apoc. Mos.*” The Greek text cited in this discussion comes from Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

⁶⁶ The influence of Hooker may be seen e.g. in Dunn (*Romans 1–8*, 53, 60–61, 69, 72, 73, 76) and Wright (“Letter to the Romans,” 432–33), while Jonathan A. Linebaugh (“Announcing the Human:

I shall argue that neither of these claims to discern in Rom 1 an appeal, in the first instance, to the Adamic fall are persuasive. Besides her problematic assumption of an Adam myth, Hooker's arguments for shared language and sequence between Rom 1:18–32 and Gen 3 do not stand up to scrutiny, a point made by A. J. M. Wedderburn.⁶⁷ As for Levison, he improperly presumes that Rom 1:23 concerns an exchange of nature rather than in objects of worship. Moreover, his reading fails to account for the generic context of Rom 1:18–32: Hellenistic Jewish polemic against idolatry and immorality that both genuinely indicts Gentiles (cf. Rom 3:9) and prepares for the inferential incorporation of a Jewish interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence.

Instead, with Hyldahl, I shall suggest that rhetorically the human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27 serves to depict the inversion of creation that occurs in idolatry, reinforcing what *initially* appears to be the application of Ps 106(105):20 *only* to Gentiles. In that sense Paul appeals not to the Adamic fall but to idolatrous inversion. Yet, I shall leave open the possibility that Rom 1:23 is informed, even if inchoately, by a Pauline conception of the Adamic fall, one present elsewhere in Romans. My claim is simply that this notion plays no immediate rhetorical role in Paul's argument. With this in mind, we turn to consider the claims of Hooker and Levison before engaging in a critique of them.

Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11,” *NTS* 57 [2011]: 214–37[230, n. 58]) endorses the arguments of Levison. Against discerning a rehearsal of the Adamic fall in Rom 1, see Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 274, 279, 283–84; Moo, *Epistle to the Romans*, 109–10, n. 85; Schreiner, *Romans*, 82, 93; Keck, *Romans*, 63–64.

⁶⁷ “Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans,” in *Studia Biblica 1978: III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; JSNTSup 3; Sheffield: JSOT, 1980), 413–30.

Shared Language and Sequence: M. Hooker (1960)

Hooker proposes that in Rom 1:18–32 Paul “is describing man’s sin in relation to its true Biblical setting—the Genesis narrative of the Creation and the Fall.”⁶⁸ The features of Rom 1:18–32 that commend such a reading are, as noted, shared language and sequence with Gen 1–3 as well as a broader depiction of the results of the fall in terms of idolatry, sexual immorality, and general wickedness, “the three forms in which Paul saw sin as particularly rampant in his time” but that “may also be linked with the *Adam myth*.”⁶⁹ Beginning with shared language, beyond the parallels between Rom 1:23 and Gen 1:20–27, Hooker notes, for example, that the terms ἀόρατος (“invisible”) and σκοτίζω (“darken”) in Rom 1:20, 21 echo Gen 1:2: ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος ... καὶ σκότος ἐπάνω τῆς ἀβύσσου (“But the earth was invisible ... and darkness was over the abyss”). She struggles, however, to find parallels with Gen 3, suggesting, for instance, that the expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”; Rom 1:24, 26a, 28), even if employing a different verb, “may perhaps reflect something of the force of ἐξαπέστειλεν [“he sent out”] ... ἐξέβαλεν [“he cast out”] in Gen iii. 23 f.”⁷⁰

In regard to shared sequence, Hooker sees the story of Adam in Rom 1:19–23, 25, 32. She states:

Of Adam it is supremely true that God manifested to him that which can be known of him (v. 19); that from the creation onwards, God’s attributes were clearly discernible to him in the things which had been made, and that he was thus without excuse (v. 20). Adam, above and before all men, knew God, but failed to

⁶⁸ Hooker, “Adam,” 300.

⁶⁹ Hooker, “Adam,” 301, italics mine. See also Hooker’s own summary of her argument at the beginning of “A Further Note on Romans 1,” *NTS* 13 (1966): 181–83.

⁷⁰ Hooker, “Adam,” 301.

honour him as God, and grew vain in his thinking and allowed his heart to be darkened (v. 20). Adam's fall was the result of his desire to be as God, to attain knowledge of good and evil (Gen. iii. 5), so that, claiming to be wise, he in fact became a fool (v. 21). Thus he not only failed to give glory to God but, according to rabbinic tradition, himself lost the glory of God which was reflected in his face (v. 23) [*Gen. Rab.* 11.2; 12.6; *Sanh.* 38b; *GLAE* 20–21]. In believing the serpent's lie that his action would not lead to death (Gen. iii. 4) he turned his back on the truth of God, and he obeyed, and thus gave his allegiance to a creature, the serpent, rather than to the Creator (v. 25). Adam, certainly, knew God's δικαίωμα ["righteous requirement"] (cf. Rom. v. 12–14); by eating the forbidden fruit he not only broke that δικαίωμα, but also consented with the action of Eve, who had already taken the fruit (v. 32).⁷¹

As for the results of the fall, Hooker points to further resonances with the early chapters of Genesis, including, once again, "worship of the creature (v. 25), parallel to Adam's sin" in Gen 3, "sexual perversion and unnatural intercourse (vv. 26 f.), which in Genesis is found in vi. 1–4," and the other forms of sin catalogued in Rom 1:28–31, which are, similar to Gen 6:5, "the immediate result of lust."⁷²

Exchange of Nature: J. R. Levison (2004)

Throughout her article Hooker assumes the existence of an Adam myth upon which Paul had drawn and which would, in turn, have allowed Paul's readers/hearers to recognize the allusive presence of Adam's story in Rom 1:18–32. This is especially evident in her numerous references to rabbinic tradition, such as in the extended quotation above. In his 1988 *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism*, however, Levison argued convincingly that "the 'motifs' of an 'Adam speculation' or 'Adam myth' which

⁷¹ Hooker, "Adam," 300–301. The rabbinic references in brackets, updated to reflect SBL abbreviations (except that *GLAE* has been used instead of *Apoc. Mos.*; cf. n. 65), come from *ibid*, 301, n. 1. The translation in brackets, however, is mine.

⁷² Hooker, "Adam," 302.

the last generation of scholars discerned in Early Judaism do not exist.”⁷³ And so it is that in his own contribution to an Adamic reading of Rom 1:18–25, Levison seeks to identify “correspondences with Rom 1 in what has come to us as a single literary tradition, the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, rather than in a reconstructed speculative Adam tradition.”⁷⁴

Although Levison does not go so far as to suggest literary influence,⁷⁵ he does propose that “the Greek *Life* contains in much fuller form interpretive developments that are quite astonishingly similar to those that Paul himself makes in far briefer compass.”⁷⁶ Chief among these interpretive developments are two related exchanges which represent expanded parallels to Rom 1:23: the exchange of God’s glory for mortality and the exchange of natural dominion for unnatural subservience to animals. Lacking the cognate verbs ἀλλάσσω/μεταλλάσσω (“change”/“exchange”), the first exchange of divine glory for mortality is conceptual rather than terminological. Adam says to Eve: ὦ γύναι πονηρά, τί κατειργάσω ἐν ἡμῖν; ἀπηλλοτριώσας με ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. (“O wicked woman, *what have you done to us?* You have alienated me from the glory of God”;

⁷³ John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 13. Positively stated, Levison argued that “early Jewish interpretations of Adam are remarkably diversified because each author employs and adapts Adam according to his *Tendenz*” (p. 14). Yet, while drawing attention to diversity, Levison did find unifying features within wisdom and apocalyptic traditions as well as in authors who consciously employed Greco-Roman concepts. See pp. 159–60.

⁷⁴ Levison, “Greek *Life*,” 522.

⁷⁵ Concerns about multiple text forms as well as considerable debate about the dating and character of the particular form upon which he does focus (i.e. whether it is a first-century Jewish or third-century Christian composition) account for Levison’s (“Greek *Life*,” 522) hesitancy to ascribe literary influence to the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*. See also his *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SBLEJL 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000). For an introduction to the complex issues involved in interpreting the Greek *Life*, see Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997).

⁷⁶ Levison, “Greek *Life*,” 523.

GLAE 21.6). That this alienation entails human mortality is suggested by the affinities with Adam's earlier rebuke of Eve: *τί κατειργάσω ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπήνεγκας ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὀργὴν μεγάλην, ἣτις ἐστὶν θάνατος κατακυριεύων παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν*; (*“What have you done to us and have you brought great wrath upon us, which is death reigning over all our race?”*; GLAE 14.2).

In contrast to the first, the second exchange of natural dominion for unnatural subservience to animals is terminological. This exchange is highlighted at the end of the following conversation between Eve and a wild beast that had attacked her son Seth:

Table 44. GLAE 10.3–11.2

<p>³ καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸ θηρίον· ὦ σὺ θηρίον πονηρόν, οὐ φοβεῖ σὺ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ πολεμῆσαι; πῶς ἠνοίγη τὸ στόμα σου; πῶς ἐνίσχυσαν οἱ ὀδόντες σου; πῶς οὐκ ἐμνήσθης τῆς ὑποταγῆς σου ὅτι πρότερον ὑπετάγης τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θεοῦ;</p> <p>^{11.1} τότε τὸ θηρίον ἐβόησεν λέγων· ὦ Εὐά, οὐ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἡ πλεονεξία σου, οὔτε ὁ κλαυθμός, ἀλλὰ πρὸς σέ, ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν θηρίων ἐκ σοῦ ἐγένετο. ² πῶς ἠνοίγη τὸ στόμα σου φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, περὶ οὗ ἐνετείλατό σοι ὁ θεὸς μὴ φαγεῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ; διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμῶν αἱ φύσεις μετελλάγησαν. νῦν οὖν οὐ δυνήσκει ὑπενεγκεῖν ἐὰν ἀπάρξωμαι ἐλέγχειν σε.</p>	<p>³ And [Eve] said to the wild beast, “O you wicked beast, are you yourself not afraid to attack the image of God? How was your mouth opened? How did your teeth strengthen? How did you not remember your subjection, that formerly you were subject to the image of God?”</p> <p>^{11.1} Then the wild beast cried out, saying: “O Eve, your greed is not for us nor your weeping, but for you, since the rule of the wild beasts has come about from you. ² How was your mouth opened to eat from the tree about which God commanded you not to eat from it? On account of this, our natures have also been exchanged. Now, therefore, you will not be able to endure it, if I begin to rebuke you.</p>
---	--

Discerning an allusion to Gen 1:26 in the twofold reference to the “image of God” and associated discussion, Levison comments on the exchange to which the wild beast refers as follows:

The wild animal has entirely forgotten its subordinate place in the natural order – an order firmly established in Gen 1:26, to which Paul also alludes – and has

begun to rule in humankind's stead.... The exchange of places between humans and animals that transpires in the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve* is accompanied by the verb μεταλλάσσειν.... I suspect, in a context preoccupied by the question of human and animal dominion, that the words mean more than merely a change in the nature of animals; they express rather that the animals have taken on the nature of humans, while humans have become servile, as the animals once were, with softened teeth and a docile nature.⁷⁷

Since Levison does not advocate a literary relationship, he is careful not to overemphasize the lexical parallel of μεταλλάσσω. Nonetheless, he proposes that once Paul has moved beyond his evocation of Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23, he adopts this verb to express the exchange that has occurred:

Those whom Paul condemns have exchanged (ἔλλαξαν) glory for mortality; they have exchanged (μετήλλαξαν) truth for a lie, that is, they have worshiped and served the creation rather than the creator. In short, they have lost glory, immortality, and dominion and gained in their stead anger, death, and subservience to the creation.⁷⁸

Significantly, Levison regards both Rom 1:23 and 1:25 as “exchanges” and, interpreted in light of the Greek *Life*, presumes that what is exchanged concerns the nature or status of the worshiper, rather than the objects of worship. As we shall see, such an interpretation, at best, substitutes what is secondary, for that which is primary.

Idoltrous Inversion

Absence of Shared Language and Sequence

As alluded to above, important cautions regarding an Adamic fall reading of Rom 1:18–32 come from A. J. M. Wedderburn.⁷⁹ Responding specifically to Hooker, he

⁷⁷ Levison, “Greek *Life*,” 532–33.

⁷⁸ Levison, “Greek *Life*,” 533.

⁷⁹ “Adam,” 413–19.

sounds two warning notes based upon “the actual wording of Paul’s text.”⁸⁰ One is that “the language of *Genesis* is echoed at several points in this passage, but the *allusions are to ch. 1, not ch. 3.*”⁸¹ The difficulty of finding verbal parallels to Gen 3 may be illustrated by Hooker’s abandonment of her own proposal that παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”; Rom 1:24, 26a, 28) reflects ἐξάπεστειλεν (“he sent out”) and ἐξέβαλεν (“he cast out”) of Gen 3:23–24. As discussed in chapter two, in her subsequent “A Further Note on Romans 1,” Hooker points instead to the “gave-over” expression in Ps 106(105):41a as the source for Rom 1:24, 26a, 28.⁸²

In addition to undermining Hooker’s argument concerning shared language between Rom 1:18–32 and Gen 3, Wedderburn also challenges her argument concerning a shared sequence. He notes that certain aspects of Rom 1:18–32 are unexpected if Gen 3 has played a central role in its formation. For example, the order of Adam’s turning is different. “Adam in Genesis only turns away from God after his sin and only then is he barred from God’s presence (*Gen.* 3:8, 23f.),” whereas in Romans “man turns away from God and only then does he fall into idolatry (1:21–5).”⁸³ Further obscuring the attempt to discern a shared sequence is that Adam’s fall was not occasioned by idolatry, something

⁸⁰ Wedderburn, “Adam,” 414.

⁸¹ Wedderburn, “Adam,” 416, italics in original.

⁸² Hooker, “Further,” 183. That Levison (“Greek *Life*,” 524–25) resorts to appealing to the Hebrew term לַהֲשִׁיבֵל of Gen 3:6, which he connects to Rom 1:22, further illustrates the difficulty of finding *Greek* verbal parallels with Gen 3.

⁸³ Wedderburn, “Adam,” 415–16.

even Hooker concedes when she states, “there is nothing in the Genesis narrative to suggest that Adam was an idolater.”⁸⁴

Mention of falling into idolatry brings us to the other warning note sounded by Wedderburn. For our purposes, it may be stated as follows: the allusion to a fall in Rom 1:23 is not to Adam’s fall but, as the use of language drawn from Ps 106(105):20 suggests, to Israel’s fall into idolatry.⁸⁵ Even if the reference to the calf is omitted and replaced by human and animal imagery taken from Gen 1:20–27, facilitating an ironic application to Gentiles, that does not alter the fact that the change to which Paul alludes is Israel’s, not Adam’s. Although Wedderburn cautions not to make too much of this difference, since “Jewish tradition frequently associated Adam’s fall and the sin of the golden calf,”⁸⁶ such an association derives from rabbinic literature “dating from many centuries later than Paul...”⁸⁷ Moreover, Wedderburn, like Hooker, was writing prior to the appearance of Levison’s *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism*, which, as noted above, argued convincingly against the existence of an Adam myth in the Second Temple period.

⁸⁴ Hooker, “Adam,” 301. Cf. Wedderburn, “Adam,” 415.

⁸⁵ Because Wedderburn (“Adam,” 414, italics his) allows for the possibility that, in addition to Ps 106(105):20, Rom 1:23 alludes to Jer 2:11, building upon an earlier evocation of Jer 2:5 in Rom 1:21, as well as to Deut 4:15–18, he formulates this warning note as: “[T]he Old Testament allusions to a fall in this passage are to accounts, not of *Adam’s fall*, but of *Israel’s fall into idolatry*.” In contrast to Wedderburn, I have already suggested that the greater parallelism in Rom 1:23 with Ps 106(105):20 and Gen 1:20–27 exclude allusions to Jer 2:11 and Deut 4:15–18 respectively. Against the view that Rom 1:21 evokes Jer 2:5, cf. n. 35.

⁸⁶ Wedderburn, “Adam,” 414–15.

⁸⁷ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 274.

Exchange of Objects of Worship

What about Levison's own proposal that the interpretive developments in the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*, especially the two exchanges of God's glory for mortality and of natural dominion for unnatural subservience to animals, provide the hermeneutical lens through which to interpret Rom 1:18–25? Assessing this proposal requires answering a question raised by Wedderburn, one that concerns the nature of the change to which Rom 1:23 refers: "[I]s Paul ... talking about a change in the object of man's worship or a change in man's nature?"⁸⁸ The key to answering this question is how one construes the term εἰκών ("image"), which, in turn, is a function of the background against which one reads εἰκών.⁸⁹ There are two basic options. One is that εἰκών in Rom 1:23 refers to an "image" in the sense of what humanity bears, as in Gen 1:26–27 and the normal usage of this term in the Pauline corpus (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Col 1:15; 3:10). If one adopts this understanding of εἰκών, then the change to which Rom 1:23 refers is in human nature. The other option is that εἰκών in Rom 1:23 means an "image" in the sense of an idol, as in Deut 4:16 and many other OT texts. There is thus a change in the objects of worship (the glory of the incorruptible God for human and animal idols) but not in human nature.

These two options, however, are not mutually exclusive if εἰκών is interpreted in context. In accordance with its source text, Gen 1:20–27, εἰκών in Rom 1:23 refers to an "image" in the sense of what humanity and animals bear. Yet, preposed to εἰκών is

⁸⁸ Wedderburn, "Adam," 417.

⁸⁹ Cf. the discussion of εἰκών in Hooker, "Adam," 297–98, 304–5.

language drawn from Ps 106(105):20. Significantly, the conflated evocation that results does not say: καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ *ἐν εἰκόνι* φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν (“And they changed the glory of the incorruptible God *for the image* of a corruptible human being and of birds and of four-footed animals and of serpents”). If it did, one could argue that an actual human being as well as the animals listed replaced God in that each bears his/its own image. Instead, Rom 1:23 refers to changing the glory of the incorruptible God *ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνοσ*... (“*for the likeness of an image*...”). Thus it is not human/animal image-bearers that have replaced God but rather the likeness of them, that is, idols made to resemble the image-bearers. There is, in other words, a play on the two meanings of εἰκών. Considered on its own, εἰκών retains its signification in Gen 1:26–27 as a borne-image; yet the broader prepositional phrase of which it is a part refers to idols, cleverly depicted as the likeness of image-bearers, whether of a human or animals. Paul, then, in Rom 1:23 is talking about a change in the objects of worship, not in human nature.

With Wedderburn’s question answered, we may now assess Levison’s proposal. I already noted in chapter two that he fails to consider the possibility that Paul adopts the verb μεταλλάσσω in Rom 1:25 and 26b (which Levison fails to mention) simply because he is depicting “exchanges” subsequent to and following from the initial idolatrous ἀλλάσσω (“change”) of Rom 1:23, as opposed to drawing upon tradition that finds fuller development in the Greek *Life*. Such a criticism could be obviated if Levison’s reading of the first two Pauline exchanges proved convincing, but that is precisely the problem. It does not. Levison’s reading presumes that, in the first instance, Rom 1:23 refers to a

change in human nature rather than in the objects of worship. Neither does Rom 1:25 support Levison as that exchange recapitulates the initial change (cf. p. 302).

Most problematic of all for Levison's position and for any reading that regards Rom 1:23, in the first instance, as referring to the Adamic fall and an accompanying change in human nature is the generic form of 1:18–32. As I shall discuss more fully in the surface analysis section, Paul has cast his argument in the mold of Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality, in general (*Let. Aris.* 128–171; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81; *Sib. Or.* 3.8–45), and perhaps Wis 13–15, in particular. Paul has done this with the intention of both genuinely indicting Gentiles (cf. Rom 3:9) and also preparing for the inferential incorporation of a Jewish interlocutor, beginning in Rom 2:1, into the preceding sin–retribution sequence, one initiated by the idolatrous change of Rom 1:23. The problem with claiming that Rom 1:23 transparently rehearses the Adamic fall in such a manner as to implicate all humanity, not only the customary Gentile targets of such polemic but also Jews, is that it would remove the element of surprise that Paul's argument exploits in the rhetorical turn of Rom 2:1. I suggest, then, that Hyldahl was right: the human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27 serves to depict the inversion of creation that occurs in idolatry, reinforcing what *initially* appears to be the application of Ps 106(105):20 *only* to Gentiles. In that sense Paul primarily appeals not to the Adamic fall but to idolatrous inversion.

Yet, having said all of this against the Adamic fall view, it actually proves quite difficult to rule out this reading entirely. The later depiction of all (i.e. Jews and Gentiles) falling short of God's glory in Rom 3:23 and the restoration of that glory in Rom 8:21,

28–30, not to mention the comparison of Adam and Christ in Rom 5:12–21, leave open the possibility that Rom 1:23 is informed, even if inchoately, by a conception of the Adamic fall, one that may, in certain respects, find fuller development in the Greek *Life*. In other words, although Rom 1:23 primarily *denotes* a change in the objects of worship, it may also secondarily *connote* a change in human nature, once the broader scope of Pauline thought, especially in Romans, is taken into account. Assessing this possibility any further, however, is beyond the scope of the current project. My claim is simply that this conception does not play any immediate rhetorical role in Paul’s argumentation.

What does play an immediate role is the initial idolatrous “change” (ἀλλάσσω) of Rom 1:23, articulated using language drawn from Ps 106(105):20 and human and animal imagery taken from Gen 1:20–27. This conflated evocation depicts the idolatrous inversion of worshiping corruptible human and animal idols rather than the glory of the incorruptible God. Finally, following upon the “change” of Rom 1:23 are two related “exchanges” (μεταλλάσσω) in Rom 1:25, 26b. The end result is that the “(ex)change” portion of the sin–retribution sequence in Rom 1:22–32 derives from Ps 106(105):20.

Retribution in Romans 1:24, 26a, 28: Psalm 106(105):41a

The insight that the “(ex)change” of Rom 1:23, 25, 26b derives from Ps 106(105):20 proves important for discerning the origin of the corresponding expression παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28. Although variants of this same expression occur a number of times in the Jewish scriptures, whether to depict God giving over Israel’s enemies (cf. e.g. Deut 31:5; Josh 11:8; 24:8, 10, 11; Jdg 11:32; 12:3; 1 Sam 14:12) or even Israel herself (cf. e.g. Deut. 32:30; Josh

24:33; Jdg 2:14; 6:1; 13:1), priority should be given to the instance in Ps 106(105):41a:

καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ κύριος] εἰς χεῖρας ἔθνῶν (“And [the LORD] gave them over into the hands of the Gentiles”). As discussed in chapter four, Ps 106(105):41a follows the chiasm of key words in vv. 34–40. This chiasm traces the bloody defilement of the Land, prohibited in Num 35:33–34, to Israel’s sacrifice of her own children to Canaanite idols, idols served as a consequence of mixing with and learning from the very Gentile inhabitants whom Israel disobediently failed to destroy, a failure that led the LORD to become enraged at his own people. The LORD’s response in Ps 106(105):41a is not only punitive but also preservative since Israel’s Gentile-like behavior, if left unchecked, would have meant the cessation of her existence as a distinct people.

In Romans, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, at least within the context of 1:18–32, possesses only a punitive/retributive dimension. Otherwise, discerning in this phrase an evocation of Ps 106(105):41a, in particular, lends rhetorical force to Paul’s argumentation, once Rom 2:1–4 inferentially incorporates a Jewish interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence of 1:22–32. Indeed, viewed in light of the understanding of Jewish identity in Ps 106(105), this interlocutor may legitimately be charged with idolatrous and immoral actions.

Perhaps the primary objection to discerning an evocation of Ps 106(105):41a in παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός is that in Rom 1:24, 26a this expression is used in relation to dishonorable desires (ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ... τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι ... εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας [“to desires ... to dishonor ... to passions of dishonor”]) that give rise to same sex acts among both women and men (cf. p. 302), a motif absent from Ps 106(105). Three considerations,

however, mitigate the force of this objection. First, the pronounced emphasis on Israel's imitation of Gentiles in the key-word chiasm of Ps 106(105):34–40, provides implicit grounds for associating a Jew with any illicit acts ascribed to Gentiles. Second, even if no mention is made of same sex acts, v. 39b says of Israel: καὶ ἐπόρνευσαν ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν (“And they played the harlot in their practices”), referring to spiritual as well as physical infidelity. Moreover, as noted in chapter four, the expression ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν also occurs in v. 29 as part of an allusion to Israel's fornication during the Baal of Peor episode (cf. Num 25:1–18; Ps 106[105]:28–31). Thus Israel's sexually immoral conduct both with and in imitation of Gentiles figures prominently in Ps 106(105). Third, although ἐπιθυμία (“desire”) is not used in relation to sexual craving, as in Rom 1:24, the term does occur in Ps 106(105):14 in reference to Israel's excessive “desire” for quail (cf. Num 11:4).

These three considerations, taken together, allow for the possibility, perhaps even probability, that Ps 106(105) served as the basis for Paul's extension of the theme of sexual immorality. If so, Paul has transferred the notion of excessive desire to the sexual arena and applied it to same sex acts. Finally, we may recall that the giving-over of Rom 1:28 is to an unfit mind, which leads, in turn, to improper actions of all kinds (vv. 29–31), something for which the litany of sins in Ps 106(105) provides ample warrant.

Conflation and Chiasm in Romans 2:5–11: Psalm 106(105):23a,d and

Deuteronomy 9:27; 10:16, 17

The third and final scriptural allusion throughout Rom 2:5–11 returns indirectly to the account of the calf in Ps 106(105):19–23. Having earlier alluded to a part of the

passage that derives from Exodus (Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23; cf. Exod 33:5–6), Paul now turns directly, even if evocatively, to Deuteronomy, perhaps wishing to mediate as well as call to mind elements of an interpretive tradition that provided a rationale for the LORD’s desire, expressed twice in Ps 106(105):23a,d and deriving from Deuteronomy (9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10), to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) Israel because of the calf. This interpretive tradition, if it existed, focused on the hermeneutical significance of three verses: Deut 9:27b; 10:16, 17. In Deut 9:27b, Moses intercedes for Israel by asking the LORD not to “look upon the hardness [σκληρότητα] of this people and their impious actions [ἀσεβήματα] and sins.” As discussed in chapter four, this pivotal attribution of “impious action” (ἀσέβημα) *both* explains why the LORD desired to destroy Israel *and* equates her conduct with that of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land, whose impending “destruction” (ἐξολεθρεύω) for “impiety” (ἀσέβεια) in Deut 9:1–6 prompts the deuteronomic rehearsal of the golden calf, spanning Deut 9:7–10:11. In the midst of the following paraenesis (10:12–22), which includes content related to the calf (cf. Exod 32:13c; 33:10c–d, 16c; Deut 10:15, 21, 22b), Deut 10:16 returns to Israel’s hardened-character, providing the antidote for this problem: “Circumcise your hard-heart [σκληροκαρδίαν] and stiffen your neck no longer [οὐ σκληρυνεῖτε ἔτι].” The statement of divine impartiality that comes next in Deut 10:17, “For the LORD your God ... does not wonder [θαυμάζει] at a person and by no means takes a bribe,” especially in light of the preceding comparison between Gentile and Jewish impiety and the proselyte-oriented exhortation of vv. 18–19, serves as a warning that failure to circumcise one’s hard-heart would lead to judgment, perhaps even destruction.

In Rom 2:5–11, Paul evokes all three of these verses from Deuteronomy (9:27b; 10:16, 17), as well as the idea implicit in their association, equitable judgment, or judgment according to works. The likelihood that Paul may have drawn on an interpretive tradition is enhanced by parallels in Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305 and Sir 16:9–14. In this subsection, I shall argue that Paul’s evocation of Deut 9–10 is a consequence of the manner in which Rom 2:5–11 is framed, its emphasis on judgment according to works, and the multiple affinities between these two texts.⁹⁰ We begin our exploration of this multifaceted allusion with the opening frame of Rom 2:5a.

Opening Frame of Romans 2:5a: Deuteronomy 9:27b; 10:16 and Philo, *De specialibus legibus* 1.304–305

Paul’s characterization of the interlocutor in Rom 2:5a subtly conflates Deut 9:27b; 10:16.⁹¹ These texts are as follows:

Table 45. Deut 9:27b; 10:16 and Rom 2:5a

Deut 9:27b	Deut 10:16	Rom 2:5a
^{27b} μὴ ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν σκληρότητα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τὰ ἀσεβήματα καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα αὐτῶν....	¹⁶ καὶ περιτεμεῖσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν καὶ τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν οὐ σκληρυνεῖτε ἔτι.	^{5a} κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητα σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν

⁹⁰ Although I am the first to suggest such an extensive role for Deut 9–10 in Rom 2:5–11, Dunn (*Romans 1–8*, 89) comes close to the position I advocate when he says, “The movement of thought from 2:5–11 is in effect Paul’s elaboration of Deut 10:16–17.”

⁹¹ Scholars who have noted the parallels between Rom 2:5a and *both* Deut 9:27b; 10:16 include Cranfield, *Epistle to the Romans*, 1:145; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 83–84. Significantly, in Rom 10:6a Paul imports the phrase μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου from Deut 9:4 to introduce his exegesis of Deut 30:12–14 which follows in Rom 10:6bff. While the phrase μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου also occurs in Deut 8:17, as J. Ross Wagner (*Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans* [Boston: Brill, 2003], 161–62) notes, Deut 9:4 is most likely the “source of Paul’s quotation due to the (metaleptically suppressed) catchword ‘righteousness’ (δικαιοσύνη) in [Deut] 9:4–6,” but absent from Deut 8:17 as well as its surrounding context.

^{27b} Do not look upon the hardness of this people and their impious and sinful acts....	¹⁶ And circumcise your <u>hard-heart</u> and your neck do not <u>harden</u> still.	^{5a} But according to your hard and unrepentant heart
--	---	---

The conflation is initially discernible because the specific term for “hardness” (σκληρότης) occurs only in Rom 2:5 within the NT and, besides Deut 9:27b, just three other times in the LXX, none of which have relevance to the Pauline context (cf. 2 Sam 22:6; Isa 4:6; 28:27). Moreover, although the “hard”– (σκληρ–) root in verbal form often appears with “heart” (καρδία) in the OT (cf. e.g., Exod 4:21; 7:3, 22), the association of one of its nominal forms with “heart,” whether in the compound “hard-heart” (σκληροκαρδία) or as two separate nouns, occurs only four times: Deut 10:16; Eccl 7:25; Sir 16:10; Jer 4:4, the latter two of which refer back to Deut 10:16.⁹² Thus both the use of the particular noun “hardness” (σκληρότης) and its association with “heart” in Rom 2:5a point toward a conflation of Deut 9:27b; 10:16. As for the adjective ἀμετανόητος (“unrepentant”), Paul apparently equates failure to circumcise one’s hard-heart, in response to Deut 10:16, with an unrepentant heart, likely because the theme of repentance carries over from Rom 2:4.

Crucial corroboration for this proposed conflation of Deut 9:27b; 10:16 is found in Philo. Having discussed in *De decalogo* the Ten Words as summary headings for the particular laws, in *De specialibus legibus* Philo proceeds to elucidate these particular laws (*Spec.* 1.1). In Book 1 of this treatise, after discussing circumcision (*Spec.* 1.2–11), Philo briefly examines the particular laws falling under the First Word, the “monarchy”

⁹² The σκληρ-root as an adjectival form, whether as the compound σκληροκάρδιος or as an adjective modifying καρδία, also occurs in Prov 17:20; 28:14; Sir 3:26, 27; Ezek 3:7. Four of these five texts, however, are proverbial.

of God (*Spec.* 1.12–20), and then examines at length the particular laws relating to the Second Word, the prohibition against idolatry and its corollary: proper worship (*Spec.* 1.21–345).⁹³ As part of his general discussion relating to the summary heading of idolatry, in *Spec.* 1.299–311 Philo engages in interpretive commentary on Deut 10:12–21, the paraenesis that follows Moses’ rehearsal of the golden calf incident in Deut 9:7–10:11. Given, as I have just noted, that Philo’s interpretive commentary falls within an overall discussion of the Second Word, the prohibition against idolatry (*Spec.* 1.21–345), one should at the very least be attentive to signs that Philo has the preceding account of Israel’s idolatry in view.

As it turns out, such signs are provided in *Spec.* 1.304–305. Having discussed in *Spec.* 1.303 Israel’s election (cf. Deut 10:15) and God’s divine watering of the soul,⁹⁴ Philo turns in *Spec.* 1.304 to pitiable persons who have not participated in drinking parties of virtue, though they were present among rejoicing in righteousness and holiness. Who are such people? They are identified by ὁ νόμος (“the Law”) as ἀπερίτμητοι τὴν καρδίαν (“uncircumcised in heart”). Although the expression ἀπερίτμητοι τὴν καρδίαν may be derived from Lev 26:41, it clearly prepares for the admonition of Deut 10:16, περιτέμνεσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν (“circumcise [your] hard-heart”), cited in *Spec.*

⁹³ So Kenneth L. Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005), 104; *pace* F. H. Colson, who in his LCL introduction to *Spec.* 1 limits the section on idolatry to lines 21–31. This conflicts with Philo’s own summary of his work in *Spec.* 2.1 in which he indicates that he views *Spec.* 1 as relating to the first Two Words or “Heads” of the Law.

⁹⁴ “The figure of the divine watering of the soul is perhaps suggested by the promise of the water from heaven to irrigate the land in Deut. viii. 7 and xi. 11,” Colson, LCL, 276, n. *a*.

1.305.⁹⁵ In between the Law’s description of these persons as “uncircumcised in heart” and the command that they circumcise their hard-hearts, we are given a further clue to their identity: διὰ σκληρότητα τρόπων ἀφηνιασταί, σκιρτῶντες αὐθαδῶς καὶ ἀπαυχενίζοντες (“on account of hardness of ways [they] refuse the rein, leaping stubbornly and flailing their heads about”). The phrase σκληρότητα τρόπων (“hardness of ways”) recalls none other than Moses’ characterization of Israel in Deut 9:27b: τὴν σκληρότητα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου (“the hardness of this people”).⁹⁶ That Philo intended just such a connection is suggested by the term ἀφηνιαστής (“refusing the rein”), a cognate of which (ἀφηνιάζω [“refuse to obey the rein”]) is utilized in *Mos.* 2.169 to depict the rebellious Israelites who, zealous for Egyptian vanity (i.e., idolatry; cf. *Mos.* 2.168), pay no heed to Moses’ call for those on the LORD’s side to come to him, a call given in the midst of the golden calf incident and one to which the Levites respond (cf. Exod 32:25–29).⁹⁷ Thus, similar to Paul in Rom 2:5a, Philo evokes the golden calf incident as recounted in Deut 9:7–10:11 by combining the term σκληρότης (“hardness”) of Deut 9:27b with interpretive commentary on Deut 10:16, focusing on the need for rebellious Israelites to circumcise their σκληροκαρδία (“hard-heart”).

⁹⁵ So Colson, LCL 276–77, n. c. Additionally, the combination of ἀπερίτμητος + καρδία occurs in Est 4:17; Jer 9:25; Ezek 44:7, 9 as well as in Acts 7:51.

⁹⁶ Moses’ characterization, however, applied to *all* of Israel, while Philo seems only to be talking about the rebellious *among* Israel.

⁹⁷ *Mos.* 2.159–173 represents Philo’s retelling of the golden calf incident of Exod 32, a retelling that focuses on the Levites’ role. Cf. also *Mos.* 2.270–274; *Spec.* 1.79; 3.124–127; *Ebr.* 67.

Closing Frame of Romans 2:11: Divine Impartiality and Deuteronomy 10:17

If Paul's characterization of the interlocutor in Rom 2:5a as possessing a σκληρότητα ... καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν ("hard ... and unrepentant heart") subtly conflates Deut 9:27b; 10:16, then this coheres with the scholarly tendency to associate the statements of divine impartiality in Rom 2:11 and Deut 10:17,⁹⁸ especially since Rom 2:5–11 constitutes an integrated continuation of the indictment of an unidentified Jewish interlocutor that began in Rom 2:1 (cf. the structural analysis on pp. 306ff.). The texts of Deut 10:17 and Rom 2:11 are as follows:

Table 46. Deut 10:17 and Rom 2:11

Deut 10:17	Rom 2:11
¹⁷ ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ... οὐ θαυμάζει πρόσωπον οὐδὲ μὴ λάβῃ δῶρον....	¹¹ οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.
¹⁷ For the LORD your God ... neither wonders at a <i>person</i> nor <i>takes</i> a bribe....	¹¹ For there is no <i>partiality</i> with God.

Although the specific term employed by Paul for “partiality” (προσωποληψία) in Rom 2:11 as well as its cognates occur only in the NT and early Christian literature,⁹⁹ the concept of divine impartiality has deep roots within the Jewish scriptures. Deut 10:17, in fact, proves to be “the biblical text that contains the strongest statement” of this concept (cf. also 2 Chr 19:7; Job 34:19)¹⁰⁰ and, as the italicized script in table 46 indicates, the etymological roots of προσωποληψία (πρόσωπον [“person”] and λαμβάνω [“take”]) do

⁹⁸ See, for example, William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (5th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902), 58; Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 9–13; Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 111.

⁹⁹ Cf. Acts 10:34; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; Jas 2:1, 9; 1 Pet 1:17; *1 Clem.* 1:3; *Barn.* 4:12; *Pol. Phil.* 6:1. Cf. also Matt 22:16; Mark 12:14; Luke 20:21.

¹⁰⁰ Bassler, *Divine Impartiality*, 88. The influence of Deut 10:17 may be seen, for example, in Philo (*Spec.* 1.307; 4.177; *Dec.* 41; *Mos.* 2.238). See the discussion in *ibid.*, 88–104.

occur in Deut 10:17.¹⁰¹ Thus, even apart from the proposed evocation of Deut 9:27b and 10:16 in Rom 2:5a, a strong case can be made that Rom 2:11 recalls Deut 10:17.

Judgment according to Works in Romans 2:6–11 and Sirach 16:9–14

In chiastic parallel with the declaration of divine impartiality in Rom 2:11 is the principle of equitable judgment, or judgment according to works, in Rom 2:6. Even if influenced in wording by Ps 62(61):12(13) and Prov 24:12, the emphasis on judgment according to works in Rom 2:6 may be regarded as yet another indication of the influence of Deut 9–10, this time in the form of an inference drawn from its juxtaposition of Gentile and Jewish sin. In fact, one finds just such an inference in Sir 16:9–14, a text that shares with Rom 2:6–11 formal, conceptual, and, intertextual similarities.

Sir 16:9–14 is part of a larger passage in which the author “describes how God punishes without fail the wicked for their sins.”¹⁰² The author’s description begins in v. 5 with personal testimony to this truth by way of sight and sound, the latter of which prepares for a series of scriptural allusions that follow. In short order, the author evokes in vv. 6–8 the incineration of Korah, Dathan, Abiram and their followers (v. 6a; cf. Num

¹⁰¹ The two terms etymologically evocative of *προσωπολημψία* (and vice versa) are separated in the two halves of Deut 10:17, rather than combined as in Ps 82(81):2. In other words, in Ps 82(81):2 one finds *λαμβάνω* + *πρόσωπον* to communicate the idea of impartiality, more transparently related to *προσωπολημψία* than *θαυμάζω* + *πρόσωπον* in Deut 10:17a. In Lev 19:15, however, one finds *λαμβάνω* + *πρόσωπον* and *θαυμάζω* + *πρόσωπον* used in synonymous parallelism. This implies the interchangeability of these expressions and suggests that the use of one could easily remind a person of the other. That Paul was familiar with the larger pericope of which Lev 19:15 is a part is suggested by his citation of Lev 19:18 in Rom 13:9. Note also that in Jude 16 one finds *θαυμάζω* + *πρόσωπον* to convey the idea of partiality.

¹⁰² Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 273.

16:1–35; cf. also Sir 45:18–19) as well as Israel (v. 6b; cf. Num 11:1–3), the rebellious giants of Gen 6:1–4 (v. 7), and the demise of Lot’s arrogant neighbors (v. 8).¹⁰³

That brings us to Sir 16:9–14. In 16:9–10, Sirach compares the LORD’s merciless dispossession and destruction of the sinful Gentile inhabitants of the Land to the treatment of the Exodus generation of Israelites, numbering six-hundred thousand (cf. Exod 12:37; Num 11:27; Sir 46:8), “who were aligned with their hard-heart [σκληροκαρδία].”¹⁰⁴ The annihilation of the former implies the annihilation of the latter. Although the Exodus generation was condemned to die in the wilderness due to the Kadesh Barnea rebellion (cf. Num 13:1–14:35; Deut 1:19–46), not the golden calf incident, the very comparison between the Gentile inhabitants of the Land and the Exodus generation recalls Deut 9–10, in general, just as the reference to their “hard-heart” (σκληροκαρδία), evokes Deut 10:16, in particular. Moreover, the focus upon Gentle and Israelite *destruction* may very well derive from a contextual reading of Deut 9:27b in relation to Deut 9:1–6.

Whether or not the last suggestion regarding a contextual reading is valid, the evocation of Deut 9–10 continues in v. 11a. Sirach speculates, “Even if there was one stiff-necked [σκληροτραχήλος] person, it would be a wonder [θαυμαστόν] if this person went unpunished.” The term “stiff-necked” (σκληροτραχήλος), especially associated with

¹⁰³ For more on the allusions in vv. 6–8, see Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 273–74.

¹⁰⁴ An insertion after v. 9 in Codex Sinaiticus underscores the comparison drawn between Gentiles and Israel: ταῦτα πάντα ἐποίησεν ἔθνεσιν σκληροκαρδίοις, καὶ ἐπὶ πλῆθει ἁγίων αὐτοῦ οὐ παρεκλήθη (“All these things he did to the hard-hearted nations, and toward the multitude of his holy ones he did not relent”). For the Greek text, see Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta 12.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 197; and for the translation and a brief note about the insertion, see Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 270.

the golden calf incident (cf. Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9; cf. also Neh 9:16, 17 [2 Esd 19:16, 17]), occurs in Deut 9:6, 13, with the former occurrence initiating the deuteronomic rehearsal of the calf and the latter being employed emphatically to characterize the people. Combined with the preceding context, a virtually decisive indication that “stiff-necked” in Sir 16:11 alludes to Deuteronomy, not Exodus, is the reference to “wonder” (θαυμαστός) in relation to punishment. As seen in the quotation of Deut 10:17 above (cf. p. 343), the cognate verb “wonder” (θαυμάζω) is a key term utilized in this verse to articulate divine impartiality.¹⁰⁵ Sirach thus appears to be employing a word-play to express the LORD’s commitment to applying his impartiality to those with a “hard-heart” or “stiff-neck” *among his own people, even if just one*. What follows next in Sir 16:11b–12a is a brief meditation on contrasting divine attributes, especially mercy and wrath, which then gives way in vv. 12b–14 to the following twofold assurance of equitable judgment, or judgment according to works, resulting in either punishment or reward:

- A Equitable Judgment: ἄνδρα κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ κρινεῖ. (v. 12b)
- B Punishment: οὐκ ἐκφεύξεται ἐν ἀρπάγματι ἀμαρτωλός, (v. 13a)
- C Reward: καὶ οὐ μὴ καθυστερήσει ὑπομονὴ εὐσεβοῦς. (v. 13b)
- C' Reward: πάσῃ ἐλεημοσύνῃ ποιήσει τόπον, (v. 14a)
- [B' Punishment: Not present]
- A' Equitable Judgment: ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει. (v. 14b)
- A Equitable Judgment: “He [the LORD] will judge a person according to his works” (v. 12b)

¹⁰⁵ This intertextual relationship between Deut 10:17 and Sir 16:11 is not present in the respective Hebrew texts. Although θαυμαστός accurately renders the term נִמְנֵם in the Hebrew version of Sirach (see Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* [VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 45), this term does not appear in MT Deut 10:17. Instead, one finds the verb נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, which is translated in LXX Deut 10:17, according to sense, with θαυμάζω.

B Punishment: “A sinner will not escape with [his] plunder” (v. 13a)

C Reward: “And by no means will the perseverance of the pious fall short” (v. 13b)

C' Reward: “For every act of mercy he will make a place” (v. 14a)

[B' Punishment: Not present]

A' Equitable Judgment: “Each will find according to his works” (v. 14b)

The structure is not quite chiasmic because a second statement about punishment (**B'**) is missing. Nonetheless, the formal resemblance to Rom 2:6–11 is striking (cf. p. 315) and there is even some shared vocabulary.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, when Rom 2:5–11 and Sir 16:9–14 are compared conceptually, both texts emphasize impartial judgment (even if Sirach does so through a word-play), equitable judgment, and punishment as well as reward, all in the context of a juxtaposition of Gentile and Jewish sin. In view, then, of these formal and conceptual similarities, it is surely significant that the intertextual hints of Deut 10:16, 17 in Rom 2:5–11 are more clearly expressed in Sir 16:9–14. And perhaps a contextual reading of Deut 9:27b is also reflected in the latter text, even as the former seems to evoke this same verse. These formal, conceptual, and intertextual similarities between Rom 2:5–11 and Sir 16:9–14, however, should not be taken to suggest that Paul was alluding to or making use of the latter. Rather, they, along with the parallel conflation in Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305, are better understood as indications of an interpretive tradition, one rooted in an application of Deut 9:27b; 10:16, 17 to Gentile and Jewish sin, upon which all three texts were drawing. If the Roman Christian community had knowledge of such an interpretive tradition, then that could explain why Paul is so

¹⁰⁶ ὀργή: Sir 16:6, 11[2x]; Rom 2:5[2x], 8; ὑπομονή: Sir 16:13; Rom 2:7.

subtle in alluding to Deut 9–10. There was, in other words, no need for him to be explicit.

I shall return to this point.

Multiple Affinities

Finally, reinforcing the conflated evocation of Deut 9:27b; 10:16 in Rom 2:5a (cf. Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305), the recall of Deut 10:17 in Rom 2:11, and the inference of judgment according to works, paralleled in Sir 16:9–14, are the multiple affinities between Deut 9–10 and Rom 2:5–11, especially when Paul’s developing argument is taken into account. Although some of these affinities have been noted previously, it will be helpful to list them all now. Seven similarities stand out. First, there is a general comparison between Jews and Gentiles (Deut 9:1–6 vs. Deut 9:7–10:11; Rom 1:18–32 vs. Rom 2:1ff.; cf. also Deut 8:19–20). Second, the particular charge of ἀσέβεια (“impiety”), or ἀσέβημα (“impious conduct”), is applied to both Jews and Gentiles (Deut 9:4, 5, 27b; Rom 1:18; cf. also Rom 4:5; 5:6; 11:26). Third, the issue of idolatry is prominent (Deut 9:12; Rom 1:23). Fourth, Deuteronomy and Romans characterize Jews and Gentiles as deficient in δικαιοσύνη (“righteousness”). In Deut 9:1–6 the renunciation of righteousness sufficient to inherit the Land is the object of Israel’s threefold confession. Significantly, the implication of this threefold confession is that the Law has not produced in these second-generation Israelites the righteousness it demands. And, of course, since the Gentile inhabitants of the Land are subject to the LORD’s destruction, they are implicitly portrayed as lacking righteousness. In Romans, that Jews and Gentiles are without righteousness is the corollary of Paul’s argument that the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ

(“righteousness of God”) has been revealed in the gospel and is appropriated by faith rather than acquired through obedience to the Law (Rom 1:16–17; 3:21–26).

Fifth, God is presented as an impartial judge in both texts (Deut 10:17; Rom 2:11). Sixth, discerning in Rom 2:5a an allusion to Deut 10:16 in which Israel is commanded to circumcise her “hard-heart” coheres with Paul’s return to the need for inward circumcision in Rom 2:28–29. And seventh, the proposal that the golden calf incident, as recounted in Ps 106(105):19–23 and Deut 9:1–10:22, figures prominently, even if evocatively, throughout Rom 1:18–2:11 fits perfectly with the subsequent direction Paul’s argument takes. The primary objection a Jewish interlocutor could offer in response to someone noting the golden calf as a notorious example of Israelite idolatry is simply that this incident did not in the end eradicate the legal covenant that had just been established between the LORD and Israel. The smashed tablets were replaced by a new set (Exod 34:1–29; Deut 10:1–5). Surely Israel as the steward of God’s Law (cf. Rom 3:2; 9:4), the interlocutor could ask in protest, is to be held in esteem above idolatrous Gentiles, even if she stumbled at the start of her stewardship? And so it is, as if to preempt just such a protest, that in Rom 2:12ff. for the first time Paul explicitly addresses the Law and Israel’s obedience to it.¹⁰⁷

Lastly, we may note that this multifaceted allusion to Deut 9–10 in Rom 2:5–11 provides conclusive corroboration that the interlocutor whom Paul indicts beginning in Rom 2:1 (pavement stone three) is a Jew. Indeed, such evocations of the calf would have

¹⁰⁷ In my view, the Gentiles in Rom 2:14–15 are Christians who fulfill the Law (cf. Rom 13:8). For a thorough defense of this position, see Simon J. Gathercole, “A Law Unto Themselves: The Gentiles in Romans 2.14–15 Revisited,” *JSNT* 85 (2002): 27–49.

little relevance to a Gentile moralist. Moreover, this indirect application of Ps 106(105):23a,d in Rom 2:5–11, provides still further corroboration for the emphasis I have placed on Ps 106(105) within Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

Surface Analysis

The detailed attention to the structure and scripturally-evocative substructure of Rom 1:18–2:11 in the preceding two sections has been undertaken with the aim of preparing for the present section: surface analysis of Paul’s argumentation. At the risk of engaging in a certain degree of repetition, I intend to show how attention to the rhetorical role of Ps 106(105), including its ironic, inferential, and indirect application, leads to a coherent and even compelling interpretation of Rom 1:18–2:11. In that sense, Ps 106(105) may be regarded as the substructure upon which Paul constructed his argument. Throughout this section, I shall also note the relevance of Wis 13–15 to understanding Paul’s argument, especially its polemical form and the manner in which Paul subverts that form. Thus pavement stone four (a possible dialogue partner in Wis 11–19 [esp. chaps. 13–15]), at the very least, represents the kind of tradition Paul is engaging. This insight will, in turn, prove important for the larger context I sketch in chapter six. With these aims in mind, we turn first to the ironic application of Ps 106(105) in Rom 1:18–32.

Romans 1:18–32: Ironic Application of Psalm 106(105)

Romans 1:18–21: Revelation of and Basis for God’s Wrath

Having declared his unashamed stance regarding the salvific power of the gospel for *both Jew and Greek* in Rom 1:16–17,¹⁰⁸ Paul begins his explication of that gospel by

¹⁰⁸ On the relationship between Rom 1:16–17 and 1:18–32, see Linebaugh, “Announcing”[224–27].

focusing on the revelation of, basis for, and precipitating cause as well as results of God's wrath in 1:18–32. The continued universal dimension of Paul's thought is intimated in v. 18a: God's heavenly wrath has been revealed against *πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων* (“*all* human impiety and unrighteousness”). The basis for this wrath, according to vv. 18b–21, is unrighteous suppression of the knowledge of God, initially designated simply as the “truth” (*ἀλήθεια*) in v. 18b. Because of the intelligibility of God's revelation in creation, including his attributes, knowledge of God is universal and humans who suppress that knowledge are therefore “without excuse” (*ἀναπολόγητος*; vv. 19–20). According to v. 21, *although they knew God*, humans neither “glorified” (*δοξάζω*) nor gave thanks to him but instead became vain, or distorted, in their “reasoning” (*διαλογισμός*) and their hearts, thereby “lacked understanding” (*ἀσύνετος*), and became darkened.

With such emphases, v. 21, particularly in retrospect, performs three related roles. First, it concludes the portion of Paul's argument concerning the basis for God's wrath (vv. 18b–21), namely human culpability for suppressing the knowledge of God available in creation. Second, by mentioning failure to “glorify” God, v. 21 prepares for the next section, vv. 22–32, which focuses on the precipitating cause for divine wrath, an idolatrous “change” (*ἀλλάσσω*) involving the “glory” (*δόξα*) of God, and the morally degenerative process that results. Third, v. 21 anticipates other key elements of vv. 22–32. The statement *ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν* (“they became vain in their reasonings”) foreshadows *both* the idolatry of vv. 23, 25—since *ματαιόω* (“be/become vain”) and its cognate adjective *μάταιος* (“vain”) are often used in the Jewish scriptures

to denote idolatry (e.g. 2 Kgs 17:15; Jer 2:5; 8:19)—*and* the distorted reasoning of vv.

28, 32; while the phrase ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία (“their senseless heart became darkened”) arguably anticipates ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν, the passions of the heart which lead to dishonorable bodily treatment and desires in vv. 24, 26–27.

Romans 1:22–32: Precipitating Cause for and Results of God’s Wrath

The precipitating cause for God’s wrath and morally degenerative process that results from it are given intricate expression throughout Rom 1:22–32 in the *a–ba–ba–b* “(ex)change”/“giving-over” pattern of vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, and 28–32. The initial idolatrous “change” of the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of a corruptible human and of animals in Rom 1:22–23 (*aI*) recalls *both* the inglorious change that occurred in the golden calf incident, according to Ps 106(105):20 (cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6), *and* an inversion of the creation order in Gen 1:20–27. Although the subsequent “giving-over” of idolaters in vv. 24, 26a, 28 further recalls God’s response to *Israelite* sin in Ps 106(105):41a, two considerations suggest that, in spite of the inclusive “*all*” of Rom 1:18a and the conspicuous absence of identifying references to “Gentiles” (ἔθνη/ἔθνικοί) (the significance of which only becomes clear after the rhetorical turn of Rom 2:1),¹⁰⁹ Paul intended for these allusions to Ps 106(105) to be *initially* and also *genuinely* (cf. Rom 3:9) interpreted as ironic applications of this psalm to non-Jewish humanity. The first is that Paul’s allusion to Ps 106(105):20 in Rom 1:23 omits reference to the calf

¹⁰⁹ Tobin (*Paul’s Rhetoric*, 110) rightly draws attention to the manner in which the inclusive *all* and absence of reference to Gentiles “set the stage for Paul’s later arguments about the equally sinful status of Jews and Gentiles,” although he regards the turn to a Jewish interlocutor as not taking place until Rom 2:17.

itself and substitutes in its place human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27, facilitating an ironic application to Gentiles. The second consideration concerns genre. Paul has cast his argument in the mold of Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality, in general (*Let. Aris.* 128–171; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81; *Sib. Or.* 3.8–45), and perhaps Wis 13–15, in particular.

Indeed, a deep structural coherence exists between Wisdom and Romans regarding the outcome of idolatry. Wisdom expresses this in two principles: 14:12, regarding the intention of idol-making as the beginning of “sexual immorality” (πορνεία); and 14:27, regarding the worship of idols as the beginning, cause, and end of every evil—a principle that follows a lengthy vice list (14:22–26). Like Wisdom, Rom 1:22–32 first concentrates on the sexual immorality that results from idolatry and then secondly on the multitude of vices that result from idolatry as well.

Sexual immorality comes sharply into focus by the end of Rom 1:24–27. The first “giving-over” in v. 24 (*b1*) is to desires to dishonor one’s body (ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ... τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα), a punitive measure, Paul stresses once more in v. 25 (*a2*), for persons who have idolatrously “exchanged” Creator for creature. The second “giving-over” in v. 26a (*b2*) then returns to dishonorable desires, or passions (πάθη ἀτιμίας), and the third “exchange” of vv. 26b–27 (*a3*), rather than returning yet again to idolatry, clarifies the precise nature of these passions: same sex acts among both women and men. With the final “giving-over” of Rom 1:28–32 (*b3*), Paul shifts the focus from dishonorable desires and their outcome, sexual immorality, to undiscerning minds

(ἀδόκιμον νοῦν) and their outcome, improper actions (ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα; v. 28).

These improper actions are then detailed in a vice list (vv. 29–31).

Rom 1:32, the final verse in the excoriation of idolatry and immorality, prepares for the impending transition to indicting an unidentified Jewish interlocutor. Paul refers to persons who not only “practice such things” (οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες), in spite of their knowledge of the righteous requirement of God, but also, while “doing the same” (αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν), commend other “practitioners” (τοῖς πράσσουσιν) of vice. By drawing attention to cavalier disregard for God, Paul aims to elicit a judgmental response in the implied audience of such polemic, self-identifying Hellenistic Jews (whether Christ-followers or not and including proselytes) who place their own sin in a different category than Gentiles. The emphasis on “doing the same” and “practicing such things” associates these actions with Rom 1:28b and thus, in turn, with the sin–retribution sequence expressed in the “(ex)change”/“giving-over” pattern, both parts of which derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. Paul intends for biblically-fluent Jews, attuned to listening for the kind of auditory markers provided by this pattern, to recognize all along that these vices have their origin in the foundational idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23, itself an ironic application of the golden calf incident, as recounted in Ps 106(105), to Gentiles.

Romans 2:1–4: Inferential Application of Psalm 106(105)

Beginning in Rom 2:1, however, Paul exploits the moral outrage that he has just provoked. From the preceding excoriation of idolatry and immorality, Paul draws the conclusion (διό) that his interlocutor is also “without excuse” (ἀναπολόγητος; cf. v. 20) because the interlocutor condemns others for actions that he himself commits. Although

the Jewish identity of the interlocutor does not become explicit until v. 17, it is already implicit here, as suggested by the turn upon the implied audience of such polemic and by the subversive manner in which Paul engages traditional Jewish viewpoints.¹¹⁰ In contrast to the belief expressed in Wis 15:1–2, for example, “But you, our God, are kind and true [and] patient” (Σὺ δέ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, χρηστὸς καὶ ἀληθής, μακρόθυμος) such that “even if we sin, we are yours” (καὶ ... ἐὰν ἁμαρτῶμεν, σοὶ ἐσμεν), Paul asks the interlocutor in Rom 2:4 if he despises the “kindness” (χρηστότης) and “patience” (μακροθυμία) of God, unaware that God’s “kindness” (χρηστός) leads to “repentance” (μετάνοια). Paul’s question may, in fact, be a sarcastic attempt to expose further hypocrisy, since Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19, with attention to Gentiles, acknowledge the importance of repentance if God is to overlook sin.

Whether or not Paul’s question is sarcastic along these lines, the repeated stress on the interlocutor “doing”/ “practicing” “the same”/“such things” in Rom 2:1–3 provides a clear link with 1:28b, 32 and, in turn, inferentially incorporates him into the preceding sin–retribution sequence. The *Jewish* interlocutor, in other words, is being indicted for actions that have their origin in the idolatrous “change” of v. 23 and that are also a manifestation of God’s subsequent “giving-over” of such idolaters, both elements of which, once again, derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. With the Jewish interlocutor swept up into this sin–retribution sequence, the application of Ps 106(105) loses its ironic overtones. Moreover, viewed in light of the understanding of Jewish identity in Ps 106(105), the implication of Paul’s rhetorical turn, that a Jewish

¹¹⁰ Besides the example about to be discussed, cf. also Rom 2:3, 5; Tob 4:8–10; *Pss. Sol.* 9.5; 15.8.

interlocutor is guilty of not only idolatry but also Gentile-like behavior, including sexual immorality and improper actions, has *hermeneutical* warrant (cf. p. 336). When one then begins to read Romans in light of Ps 106(105), metaleptic resonances emerge. These include a corrective to the interlocutor's attitude (cf. esp. Ps 106[105]:6; Rom 2:4) and also a preview of key developments in Romans, namely the need for atoning intervention (Ps 106[105]:23, 30; Rom 3:21–26) and the notion of righteousness being reckoned to descendants (Ps 106[105]:31; Rom 4:18–25).

Romans 2:5–11: Indirect Application of Psalm 106(105)

In Rom 2:5–11, Paul returns to Ps 106(105):19–23, the passage that forms the intertextual origin for the idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23; Paul does so not directly, however, but indirectly. As noted, Ps 106(105):19–23 is an account of the golden calf incident that conflates the versions found in Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10. Having alluded to a part of the passage that derives from Exodus (Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23; cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6), Paul now turns directly, even if evocatively, to Deuteronomy. In doing so, he has likely been influenced by the twofold reference in Ps 106(105):23a,d to the LORD's desire to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) Israel because of the calf, a desire which derives from Deut 9–10 and is central to its cautionary comparison between Gentile and Jewish sin.

This indirect application of Ps 106(105):23a,d in Rom 2:5–11, by means of Deut 9–10, proves to be the most complex scriptural evocation to discern. The reason for this complexity is that Paul appears to draw upon an interpretive tradition rooted in the hermeneutical significance of Deut 9:27b; 10:16, 17 in relation to the *impending*

destruction of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land versus Israel's *near destruction* because of the calf. I have discussed evidence, fragmentary though it may be, for such an interpretive tradition in Philo and Sirach. If Roman Christians were aware of this deuteronomic interpretive tradition, then it explains both why Paul's allusions take the form they do and how they could have been apprehended.

Paul's employment of the deuteronomic interpretive tradition begins with Rom 2:5a. He characterizes the interlocutor as possessing a "hard ... and unrepentant heart" (σκληρότητα ... καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν). Besides continuing the theme of repentance from Rom 2:4, this characterization conflates Deut 9:27b; 10:16, a conflation also found in Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305. Deut 9:27b associates Israel not only with "hardness" (σκληρότης) but also with "impious conduct" (ἀσέβημα). Given that Deut 9:1–6 twice attributes the impending destruction of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land to "impiety" (ἀσέβεια), the attribution of impious conduct to Israel provides the hermeneutically-pivotal explanation for why Israel was nearly destroyed because of the calf (cf. Deut 9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10). Deut 10:16 then constitutes related exhortation, calling Israelites to circumcise their "hard-heart" (σκληροκαρδία). The rationale for this exhortation is provided by a strong statement of divine impartiality in Deut 10:17, one that in light of the preceding cautionary comparison carries an implicit warning: If Israel does not overcome her own impious inclinations, she may face the same fate as the Gentile inhabitants of the Land.

Having begun with a characterization of the interlocutor that evocatively conflates Deut 9:27b; 10:16, Paul concludes this portion of his indictment in Rom 2:11 with the

principle of divine impartiality, thereby recalling Deut 10:17. In chiastic parallel with Rom 2:11 is the principle of equitable judgment, or judgment according to works. In between these two principles, Paul's argumentation takes the form of a double-chiasm concerning *both* the order of reward and punishment *and* the depiction of human action and the results of that action (cf. the diagram on p. 315). Breaking the symmetry of this double-chiasm are two statements stressing Jewish priority in punishment as well as reward. That the inference of judgment according to works may be discerned from and thus another means of alluding to the juxtaposition of Jewish and Gentile sin in Deut 9–10 is suggested by Sir 16:9–14, a text that shares formal, conceptual, and intertextual similarities with Rom 2:5–11 (cf. the diagram on p. 346).

The final indication that Ps 106(105) constitutes the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11 may be discerned in 2:7, 10. In the Pauline double-chiasm, these verses are parallel depictions of Reward. In Rom 2:7, those who seek “glory” (δόξα), “honor” (τιμή), and “incorruptibility” (ἀφθαρσία) receive the reward of eternal life, whereas in Rom 2:10, “glory” and “honor” are not part of the goal but, along with “peace” (εἰρήνη), the reward itself for right conduct. Significantly, three of these four terms may be related to or found in Rom 1:23.

Beginning with “honor” (τιμή), although neither this term nor one of its cognates appear in Rom 1:23, the notion of dishonorable bodily treatment and desires (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι ... πάθη ἀτιμίας) is prominent in Rom 1:24, 26, perhaps implying a prior forfeiture of honor in Rom 1:23. As for the other two terms, the change of Rom 1:23 involves the “glory” (δόξα) of the “incorruptible” (ἄφθαρτος) God for “corruptible”

(φθαρτός) human and animal idols. Thus, in the interest of indicting a Jewish interlocutor, salvation is essentially depicted in Rom 2:7, 10 as a pursuit and recovery of what was lost in Rom 1:23, with one of the key terms utilized in this depiction, “glory,” deriving in its initial appearance from Ps 106(105). This subtle depiction of salvation, then, yields concluding corroboration for the claim that constitutively as well as rhetorically, through ironic, inferential, and indirect application, the latter by means of Deut 9–10, Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

Conclusion

As indicated at the end of the preceding section, the primary purpose of this chapter has been to propose that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11, argumentation in which evocations of the calf play a prominent role. In the course of making this proposal, I have also argued for the proper alignment of all four pavement stones introduced in chapter one and discussed at length in chapter two. To make this case regarding the psalmic substructure of Paul’s argumentation and the precise manner in which the four pavement stones interlock, I have approached Rom 1:18–2:11 from three distinct though interrelated vantage points: structural, substructural, and surface analysis. A section has been devoted to each.

Calling for a paradigm reorientation, the structural analysis section showed that Paul’s argument in Rom 1:18–32 (especially vv. 22–32) hinges on the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”) in vv. 23, 25, 26b and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in vv. 24, 26a, 28, one that creates a sin–retribution

sequence with an *a–ba–ba–b* pattern (vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, 28–32). Through an inferential Διό (“Therefore”) and the charge of doing/practicing τά ... αὐτά (“the same things”) or τα τοιαῦτα (“such things”), Rom 2:1–4 then incorporates an unidentified interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence. Thus pavement stones one (Διό: a problematic particle) and two (τά ... αὐτά and τα τοιαῦτα: an uncertain similarity) may be properly aligned simply through careful attention to structure. As for pavement stone three (the unidentified interlocutor), the structural asymmetry and terminology of Rom 2:5–11 provided clues to its alignment as well. Continuing to indict the interlocutor, this portion of Paul’s argument culminates with an intricate double-chiasm concerning divine judgment, one in which references to God’s punishment Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνοσ (“of the Jew first and also of the Greek”; v. 9c) as well as his reward Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι (“for the Jew first and also for the Greek; v. 10c) intrude upon the parallelism. Moreover, the terms employed to depict the goal and gift of right conduct in vv. 7a, 10a, especially δόξα (“glory”), prove structurally significant as three of the four are either introduced in or may be associated with Rom 1:23. It is this intrusion of 2:9c, 10c, with their emphasis on judgment for the Jew *first* and the structurally-significant vocabulary of vv. 7a, 10a, that yielded clues to the interlocutor’s Jewish identity.

Focusing then on the scriptural evocations underlying the hinges of Paul’s argumentation, the substructural analysis section provided conclusive corroboration for identifying the interlocutor as a Jew, thereby allowing for proper alignment of pavement stone three. This section examined in turn: the conflated evocations of Ps 106(105):20 and Gen 1:20–27 in Rom 1:23; the punitive use of Ps 106(105):41a in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28;

and the indirect employment of Ps 106(105):23a,d in Rom 2:5–11, by means of allusions to Deut 9–10. Since each evocation considered either draws from or arguably was inspired by Ps 106(105), I proposed that this psalm may be regarded as constituting the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

The surface analysis section then read Rom 1:18–2:11 in light of the preceding analyses, showing how attention to the rhetorical role of Ps 106(105), including its ironic, inferential, and indirect application, leads to a coherent and even compelling interpretation of the text. I also noted the relevance of Wis 13–15 to understanding Paul's argument, especially its polemical form and the manner in which Paul subverts that form. Thus pavement stone four (a possible dialogue partner in Wis 11–19 [esp. chaps. 13–15]), I suggested, represents, at the very least, the kind of tradition Paul is engaging. That Paul's decision to construct his argument in Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, a particular conversation about differing understandings of Jewish identity, involving Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), is what we shall explore in the sketch of a larger context in chapter six.

CHAPTER 6
SKETCHING A LARGER CONTEXT

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, I examined Rom 1:18–2:11 from three distinct, though interrelated, vantage points: structural, substructural, and surface analysis. In the process, I argued for the proper alignment of all four pavement stones (identified in chapter one and discussed at length in chapter two) and presented my primary proposal: Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11. Ps 106(105) does so, I contend, constitutively as well as rhetorically. Constitutively, both elements of the *a–ba–ba–b* sin–retribution sequence of Rom 1:22–32 derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. Rhetorically, Paul *ironically* applies the psalmic language of idolatrous “(ex)change” (cf. Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23, 25, 26b) and God’s subsequent “giving-over” (cf. Ps 106[105]:41a; Rom 1:24, 26a, 28) to Gentiles. Aiding this ironic application is that Paul has cast his argument in the mold of Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality, with particular affinities to Wis 13–15. In Rom 2:1–4, however, Paul *inferentially* incorporates a hypocritical Jewish interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence through the charge of doing the “same.” This inferential incorporation then gives way to an *indirect* application of Ps 106(105), by means of a multifaceted allusion to Deut 9–10 throughout the intricate double-chiasm of Rom 2:5–11.

If this thesis regarding Ps 106(105) as the substructure to Paul's argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11 is valid, then there must be a broader context in which these evocations of the golden calf may be placed, one that allows for a subtle but significant use of this psalm, whether directly, even if evocatively, or indirectly, by means of Deut 9–10. Ideally, this context would explain how the golden calf incident could have been such a sensitive and malleable subject. Indeed, certain words from Ps 106(105):20 seem to have triggered an ironic and, to a Jew, innocuous application of the incident, while an inferential application of *those same words*, in the midst of sudden opposition to a Jewish interlocutor, along with other words and associated concepts drawn from Deut 9–10 then proved to be problematic for a Hellenistic Jewish sense of superiority in relation to Gentile idolatry and immorality. Moreover, this context would also explain why Ps 106(105), in particular, would have been chosen to play a central role.

The purpose of this chapter is to present a suggestive, as opposed to definitive, sketch of the larger context in which such a prominent role for evocations of the golden calf and Ps 106(105) make sense. This sketch provides intriguing corroboration for the plausibility of my primary proposal regarding the substructure of Ps 106(105). The components of this sketch include: general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire, confusion that would have made the golden calf incident an especially sensitive subject among Hellenistic Jews; a particular conversation concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106); and finally Paul's exploitation of both sides of that conversation.

The body of this chapter is divided into three sections corresponding to these components.

General Confusion: Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire

In *Against Apion* 1.224, the Jewish historian Josephus, writing at the end of the first century, insists that “our piety differs from what is customary among” Egyptians “to the same degree that the nature of God stands removed from irrational animals.”¹ This devotional distinction between Jewish monotheism and Egyptian theriolatry was not lost on Josephus’ younger contemporary, the Roman historian Tacitus. Although observing that Jews, like Egyptians, “bury the body rather than burn it,” indicating shared “belief about the world below,” Tacitus carefully notes that Jewish and Egyptian “ideas of heavenly things are quite the opposite,” in that “Egyptians worship many animals and monstrous images,” whereas “Jews conceive of one god only, and that with the mind alone” (*Hist.* 5.5).² Against the backdrop of a Hellenistic–Roman milieu, however, it was often their similarities rather than differences that stood out. As a result, “Egyptian–Judaeon culture could easily be conflated,”³ even to the point that their stark cultic

¹ On the date of *Against Apion*, see John M. G. Barclay, *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary* (ed. Steve Mason; vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*; Leiden: Brill, 2007), xxvi–xxviii. Unless noted otherwise, all translations of *Against Apion*, including the one given above, come from this work by Barclay, while any Greek text provided derives from the LCL edition. For a general introduction to Josephus, see Harold W. Attridge, “Josephus and His Works,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 185–232; Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (2d ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003).

² Unless noted otherwise, citations from ancient sources are taken from LCL editions.

³ John M. G. Barclay, “The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus’s *Against Apion*,” in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (ed. John M. G. Barclay; Library of Second Temple Studies 45; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 109–27[117].

contrast became blurred. It is in this context that Israel's idolatry with the calf proves socially significant.

The present section is composed of two subsections. The first identifies three factors that contributed to general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire. The second subsection then discusses evidence that this confusion both extended to the cultic realm and also affected the manner in which the golden calf incident was either excluded from or included in Israel's history. The end result, as we shall see, is that the golden calf incident would have been an especially sensitive and thus easily evoked subject.

Contributing Factors

Shared Customs

Circumcision

The first of three factors contributing to general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire is shared customs, specifically circumcision and food taboos. Beginning with the former, in his influential account of the Persian wars, "Herodotus devoted one complete book to Egypt," to such an extent that "This book II stands out as a more or less self-contained work."⁴ One of Herodotus' claims is that "The Egyptians and those who have learnt it from them are the only people

⁴ K. A. D. Smelik and E. A. Hemelrijk, "Who Knows not What Monsters Demented Egypt Worships?" *Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity as Part of the Ancient Conception of Egypt*, *ANRW II*, 17, no. 4 (1984): 1852–2000, 2337–57[1873]. For an introduction to Herodotus' *Hist.* 2, see Alan B. Lloyd, *Introduction* (vol. 1 of *Herodotus Book II*; Leiden: Brill, 1975); and more recently David Asheri, Alan Lloyd, and Aldo Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I–IV* (trans. Barbara Graziosi, et al.; ed. Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno; Oxford: Oxford University, 2007), 221–41.

who practice circumcision” (*Hist.* 2.36).⁵ Herodotus later returns to the topic of circumcision, citing the practice of this rite among the Colchians as proof of their Egyptian ancestry. He then states, “The Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine acknowledge of themselves that they learnt the custom from the Egyptians...” (*Hist.* 2.104). In *Ag. Ap.* 1.168–71, Josephus cites this second reference to circumcision, arguing that Herodotus knowingly referred to Jews by the designation “Syrians of Palestine” (cf. also *Ant.* 8.262).⁶ Although in context Josephus utilizes this reference to provide evidence for the antiquity of the Jews, he subsequently compares Jewish circumcision and abstention from pork to the same practices among Egyptian priests (*Ag. Ap.* 2.137–42).⁷ Significantly, Josephus is not the only ancient author to discuss the practice of circumcision in relation to Jews and Egyptians (cf. Diodorus Siculus 1.28.3; 1.55.5; Philo, *Spec.* 1.2; *QG* 3.47–48).

Abstention from Pork

As for Josephus’ mention of the food taboo of abstaining from pork, this brings us to the other shared custom between Jews and Egyptians. According to Herodotus, Egyptians considered the pig a *μιαρόν ... θηρίον* (“vile beast,” my trans.) and, consequently, refrained from eating pork except for during a festival to the moon (*Hist.*

⁵ Even if the historical veracity of this claim is questionable (so Lloyd in *Commentary on Herodotus*, 315), it does reflect Herodotus’ perception, a perception that proved to be quite influential.

⁶ There is debate about the validity of Josephus’ identification: in favor, see e.g. Menahem Stern (*From Herodotus to Plutarch* [vol. 1 of *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974], 1–4); against, see Barclay (*Against Apion*, 100, n. 558).

⁷ In addition to arguing that “this comment should not be taken as evidence, direct or indirect, that ordinary Egyptians were uncircumcised at this time,” Barclay (*Against Apion*, 241, n. 512) notes that “Josephus does not reveal the difference in character between Egyptian and Judean circumcision (the one at puberty for both sexes, the other at birth for boys).”

2.47). Egyptian disdain for swine flesh continued into and beyond the first century of the common era. Besides Josephus, Plutarch (ca. 40–120 CE), in the course of presenting a symbolic interpretation of Egyptian religion to the Roman world in *Isis and Osiris* (Latin title: *De Iside et Osiride*),⁸ notes that Egyptian priests eschew pork as well as most legumes and mutton (*Is. Os.* 5 [352f]).⁹ Like Herodotus, Plutarch later attributes priestly scruples regarding pork to their belief that the pig is an ἀνίερον ζῷον (“unholy animal,” my trans.), only to be sacrificed and eaten “at the time of the full moon” (*Is. Os.* 8 [353f–354a]).¹⁰ Jewish abstention from swine was, of course, well known in the Roman world of the first and second centuries. Tacitus, for example, provides an etiological explanation: “They [Jews] abstain from pork, in recollection of a plague, for the scab to which this animal is subject once afflicted them” (*Hist.* 5.4; cf. also Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5.1–3 [669e–671c]; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.98–99; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 3.223).

Ethnographic Origin

Tacitus’ reference to a plague, as we shall see, relates to the second factor contributing to general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire: various ethnographic models circulating in the ancient world traced Jewish origins to Egypt. John M. G. Barclay isolates three basic models along these

⁸ Plutarch, a Delphic priest, likely wrote *Isis and Osiris* at the end of his life. See J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride* (Cambridge: University of Wales, 1970), 16–18.

⁹ Smelik and Hmelrijk (“‘Who Knows’,” 1946–47) note that comparison with Egyptian texts suggests that Plutarch “had a reasonably fair knowledge of Egyptian tradition when he wrote ‘De Iside,’ even if the manner in which “he acquired this knowledge is less certain.” They propose that Plutarch, who had no understanding of the Egyptian language, “borrowed heavily from Hellenistic-Greek authors” and may also have consulted his teacher in Athens, the Egyptian Ammonius. Cf. also Griffiths, *Plutarch’s*, 1–2, 51–55, 75–110.

¹⁰ Cf. Aelian, *Nature of Animals* 10.16 (written in the late 3rd cent. CE). On Egyptian food abstention in general, see Diodorus Siculus, 1.89.4.

lines.¹¹ One depicts Jews as an Egyptian colony (Diodorus Siculus 1.28, 55; Strabo 16.2.34; 17.2.5; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 14.118); another recounts an exodus from Egypt led by figures named Hirosolymus and Juda (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2.2; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 31 [363c–d]); and in the model best known to us “there is an expulsion or voluntary exodus led by Moses, typically associated with a plague and the divinely ordained removal of disease or accursed inhabitants of Egypt.”¹² Returning to Tacitus, in *Hist.* 5.2–3 he culminates his own brief survey of ancient opinions regarding Jewish beginnings with a rather full account of this last model:¹³

Most authors agree that once during a plague in Egypt which caused bodily disfigurement, King Bocchoris approached the oracle of Ammon and asked for a remedy, whereupon he was told to purge his kingdom and to transport this race into other lands, since it was hateful to the gods. So the Hebrews were searched out and gathered together; then, being abandoned in the desert, while all others lay idle and weeping, one only of the exiles, Moses by name, warned them not to hope for help from gods or men, for they were deserted by both, but to trust to themselves, *regarding as a guide sent from heaven the one whose assistance should first give them escape from their present distress.*

They agreed, and then set out on their journey in utter ignorance, but trusting to chance. Nothing caused them so much distress as scarcity of water, and in fact they had already fallen exhausted over the plain nigh unto death, when *a herd of wild asses* moved from their pasturage to a rock that was shaded by a grove of trees. Moses followed *them*, and, conjecturing the truth from the grassy ground, discovered abundant streams of water. This relieved them, and they then marched six days continuously, and on the seventh seized a country, expelling the former inhabitants; there they founded a city and dedicated a temple.

¹¹ Barclay, “Politics of Contempt,” 114. See also Barclay’s (*Against Apion*, 341–49) discussion of the 14 versions of an Exodus narrative bequeathed to us in literary sources ranging from 300 BCE to 200 CE.

¹² Barclay, “Politics of Contempt,” 114.

¹³ See also the accounts of Manetho, Chaeremon, and Lysimachus preserved respectively in Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.227–50, 288–92, 304–11.

The heaven-sent herd of asses (highlighted in italics) requires comment. This element of the account reflects a slanderous association of Jews with the evil Egyptian deity Typhon.¹⁴ In *Is. Os.* 12–19 (353f–354a), Plutarch recounts the basic myth involving Typhon as well as the benevolent female deity Isis, her brother/mate Osiris, and their son Horus.¹⁵ A brief summary of this story will foster understanding of how slanderous the association of Jews with Typhon would have been and provide context for subsequent discussion.¹⁶

For our purposes, the myth begins when Osiris delivered the Egyptians from their primitive ways by instructing them in the art of cultivation, giving them laws, and teaching them to honor the gods.¹⁷ Upon returning home from his act of deliverance, Osiris fell victim to a plot hatched by Typhon and seventy-two conspirators. Typhon secretly measured Osiris' body and constructed an ornate chest to match its length. During a festivity, Typhon then presented this chest, promising to give it to the one who found the chest to be exactly his or her size when laying inside. With the other attendees

¹⁴ Typhon was also known as Seth. See Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 41 (367d), 49 (371b), 62 (376b).

¹⁵ In *Is. Os.* 25 (360d–e) Plutarch expresses preference for the view that Typhon, Osiris, and Isis were to be regarded as demigods, rather than gods or humans, though he later speaks of the elevation of Isis and Osiris to the status of gods on account of virtue (*Is. Os.* 27 [361e]). According to Griffiths (*Plutarch's*, 56), “This line of approach follows that laid down by Xenocrates, a pupil of Plato; it is barely applicable in any form to Egyptian religion, and least of all to the major gods Osiris, Isis and Seth.” On Plutarch's conception of the divine, see *ibid.*, 18–33.

¹⁶ For a succinct synthetic description of the broader Egyptian system of thought reflected in *Is. Os.* 12–19 (353f–354a), see Barclay, *Against Apion*, 344–47. Griffiths (*Plutarch's*, 33–74) provides a more extended discussion of the traditions related to Isis and Osiris, which had been in existence for two and a half millennia at the time Plutarch wrote and had undergone significant development.

¹⁷ This portrayal of Osiris reflects the Hellenistic image of Dionysus, the Greek god whom Plutarch identifies with Osiris (cf. *Is. Os.* 13 [356b]; 28 [362b]; 34–37 [364d–365f]). So Griffiths, *Plutarch's*, 53, 309–10.

having tried and failed to fit, Osiris climbed in and lay down. At once, the conspirators slammed and nailed the lid shut, even reinforcing it with molten lead. This chest-turned-coffin was then thrown into a river.

Eventually, the chest was retrieved by a distraught Isis, who took it to Buto, where Horus was being raised, and placed the chest in a secluded place. Yet, Typhon, hunting by moonlight, discovered the chest and dismembered Osiris' corpse into fourteen pieces, spreading them throughout Egypt. In retaliation for these acts of cruelty, Osiris came from Hades to his son Horus and trained him for battle. Once Horus was ready, he defeated Typhon and delivered him to Isis as a captive. Isis, however, did not destroy Typhon; instead she released him. Typhon apparently lost two subsequent battles but Plutarch refrains from elaborating on the myth any further.

This basic myth highlights the evil actions of Typhon, who was blamed for having “filled the whole Earth, and the ocean as well, with ills” (*Is. Os.* 27 [361d]).¹⁸ As for his relation to asses, in appearance Typhon was thought to have red hair and the coloration of an ass. Typhon's purported appearance led the Egyptians of Kopto, during certain festivals, to insult red-haired men and hurl an ass off a cliff, while the people of Busiris and Lycopolis regarded “the ass as an unclean animal dominated by some higher power because of its resemblance to Typhon” (*Is. Os.* 30 [362f]).¹⁹ Thus in depicting a herd of wild-asses as a heaven-sent guide to streams of water, the account of Jewish origins in

¹⁸ For other negative statements about Typhon, see Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 2 (351f); 39 (366c–d); 44–45 (368f–369a); 64 (376f–377a).

¹⁹ Although especially associated with the ass, Typhon was also linked to the crocodile and hippopotamus (*Is. Os.* 49–50 [371b–e]), and other animals as well (*Is. Os.* 73 [380e]). The ancient cities of Kopto, Busiris, and Lycopolis correspond to the contemporary cities of Qift, Asyut, and Abusir respectively.

Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3 associates Moses and the Hebrews whom he led out of Egypt with the evil deity Typhon (cf. also Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 31 [363c–d]).

Golden Ass Libel

This association with Typhon was reinforced by the third factor. A libel circulated that the Jews kept and worshiped the head of a golden ass, which Antiochus Epiphanes discovered when he entered the inner sanctuary of the Temple. Josephus vehemently refutes Apion's version of this libel in *Ag. Ap.* 2.80–88,²⁰ presumably because Apion had spread his version in Rome while serving as the head of an Alexandrian delegation opposed to Jewish rights in 40 CE (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.257–59). In combination with the shared customs of circumcision and aversion to pork as well as certain ethnographic models of origin, the golden ass libel fostered further confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire.

Moreover, even persons unaware of Typhon or his resemblance to an ass would have known that Egyptians engaged in theriolatry.²¹ Worship of the Apis bull, for example, was well documented. The Apis bull was regarded ὡς ἑμμορφον εἰκόνα ... τῆς

²⁰ See also *Ag. Ap.* 2.112–120; Diodorus Siculus 34/35.1–5; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5.2 (670d–e). For scholarly attempts to trace the origin of the golden ass libel, see Elias Bickerman, “Ritualmord und Eselskult: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte antiker Publizistik,” in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, vol. 2 (ed. Elias Bickerman; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 225–55; Bezalel Bar-Kochva, “An Ass in the Jerusalem Temple—The Origins and Development of the Slander,” in *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (ed. Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison; AGJU 34; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 310–26; Barclay, *Against Apion*, 350–52

²¹ In the conclusion to their extensive survey of the conception that non-Egyptians had of this aspect of Egyptian religion, Smelik and Hemelrijk (“‘Who Knows’,” 1997) state, “From the time of Herodotus onwards the knowledge of animal worship rapidly became common among the Greeks (and later among the Romans)....” Ancient references to or explanations of Egyptian theriolatry include Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.65–76; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.29; Diodorus Siculus 1.86.1–89.3; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.225; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 71–76 (379d–82c); Juvenal, *Satire* 15.1–13; Tertullian, *Nat.* 2.8; Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 3.5; Jerome, *Comm. Isa.* 4.11 (concerning Isa 11:15).

Ὅσιριδος ψυχῆς (“as the bodily image of the soul of Osiris,” Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 29 [362d];

cf. *Is. Os.* 20 [359b]; 43 [368c]).²² As Herodotus had observed in *Hist.* 3.28:

This Apis, or Epaphus, is a calf [μόσχος] born of a cow that can never conceive again. By what the Egyptians say, the cow is made pregnant by a light from heaven, and thereafter gives birth to Apis. The marks of this calf called Apis are these: he is black, and has on his forehead a three-cornered white spot, and the likeness of an eagle on his back; the hairs of the tail are double, and there is a knot under the tongue.²³

Like Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus devoted almost an entire book to Egypt from his own work Βιβλιοθήκη (“Library”), a universal history from mythological times to 60 BCE.²⁴ He included a description of the Apis bull as well (1.84.4–85.5), one focused on the ceremonies associated with the selection of a new bull and the various accounts of the mythic origins of Apis worship. The heart of this description occurs in 1.85.1–5:

There should be added to what has been said what still remains to be told concerning the ceremonies connected with the sacred bull [ταῦρον] called Apis. After he has died and has received a magnificent burial, the priests who are charged with this duty seek out a young bull [μόσχον] which has on its body markings similar to those of its predecessor; and when it has been found the people cease their mourning and the priests who have the care of it first take the young bull [μόσχον] to Nilopolis, where it is kept forty days, and then, putting it

²² The Apis cult originated in Memphis and Apis was first associated with Ptah, the chief deity of Memphis. Later association with Osiris was expressed in the compound appellation Apis-Osiris, or Osiris-Apis. The latter became conjoined to form the name Sarapis (Σάραπις), latinized to Serapis. The Sarapis cult, established by Ptolemy I (cf. Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 28–29 [361f–362e]; *Soll. an.* 36 [984a–b]; Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.83–84), became widespread during the Hellenistic period. This cult, however, differed from its namesake, as reflected in divergent iconography. Whereas Osiris-Apis was represented either as a bull or as a man with a bull’s head, depictions of Sarapis were “stripped of every theriomorphic vestige.” See Griffiths, *Plutarch’s*, 363–64, 399.

²³ This description of the Apis occurs in the context of Herodotus’ (*Hist.* 3.27–30) account of how the Persian Cambyses slaughtered the bull (cf. also Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 44 [368f]; Aelian, *Nature of Animals* 10.28). Comparison with Egyptian sources, however, suggests that Cambyses never committed this act and that the story was anti-Persian propaganda. See Smelik and Hemelrijk, “Who Knows,” 1864–69.

²⁴ Diodorus’ account of Egypt derives from Hecateus of Abdera (so Kenneth S. Sacks, “Diodorus Siculus,” in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* [3d ed.; ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth; Oxford: Oxford University, 2003], 472–73), upon whom Josephus in *Ag. Ap.* 1.183–204 also draws.

on a stage barge fitted out with a gilded cabin, conduct it as a god [ὡς θεὸν] to the sanctuary of Hephaestus at Memphis. During these forty days only women may look at it; these stand facing it and pulling up their garments show their genitals, but henceforth they are forever prevented from coming into the presence of this god [θεῶ].

Some explain the origin of the honour accorded this bull in this way, saying that at the death of Osiris his soul passed into this animal, and therefore up to this day has always passed into its successors at the times of the manifestation of Osiris; but some say that when Osiris died at the hands of Typhon Isis collected the members of his body and put them in an ox (*bous*), made of wood covered over with fine linen, and because of this the city was called Bousiris. Many other stories are told about the Apis, but we feel that it would be a long task to recount all the details regarding them.

Whether familiar with Apis worship, in particular, or simply the phenomenon of Egyptian theriolatry, in general, first-century inhabitants of Rome, who heard the golden ass libel, almost certainly would have taken this as yet another indication that Jews and Egyptians should be lumped together. We turn now to see how this confusion, unwelcome on the part of Diaspora Jews, even extended to the cultic realm.

Cultic Conflation and Calf Exclusion/Inclusion

Although not reflected in the informative, as opposed to evaluative, descriptions of Apis worship given by Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus (cf. p. 372), Egyptian theriolatry became increasingly maligned in the Greco-Roman world. Cicero, for example, writing in the second half of the first century BCE (cf. *Div.* 2.3), had said in *de Republica* 3.9.14:

[I]f one could visit many diverse nations and cities and examine them ... he would see ... that in Egypt, famed as ever changeless, which preserves written records of the events of countless ages, a bull, which the Egyptians call Apis, is deemed a god, and many other monsters and animals of every sort are held sacred as divine.

Commenting on this passage, K. A. D. Smelik and E. A. Hemelrijk observe: “In a very suggestive manner the reader is reminded of the positive conception of Egypt as a land of

age-old traditions only then to be confronted by the sharp contrast of the astonishing custom of worshipping beasts and monsters.”²⁵ Such confrontations with theriolatrous custom, whether in person or in writing, continued throughout the end of the Roman Republic and early part of the Principate to the point that Juvenal,²⁶ addressing Volusius of Bithynia, could ask in *Satire* 15.1, “[I]s there anyone who doesn’t know the kind of monsters that crazy Egypt worships?”²⁷

Diaspora Jewish writings often echo, if not exceed, Roman disdain for theriolatry.²⁸ In this case, however, negative sentiments represent attempts to dispel confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians, drawing a clear cultic boundary line between the two groups. Yet, comparisons, whether implicit or explicit, between Egyptian and Jewish food taboos as well as the manner in which the golden calf incident was either excluded from or included in Israel’s history show that these attempts at dispelling confusion were not always successful.

²⁵ Smelik and Hemelrijk, “‘Who Knows’,” 1956. On Egypt’s fame for preserving records, see Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.8–14, 28–29 and the discussion in Barclay, “Politics of Contempt,” 111–12.

²⁶ Juvenal’s writings, although hard to date, likely derive from the early second century CE. See Susanna Morton Braund, “Juvenal (Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis),” in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3d ed.; ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth; Oxford: Oxford University, 2003), 804–5.

²⁷ Cf. also the citation from Juvenal’s contemporary Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5 on p. 364.

²⁸ Cf. e.g. Wis 15:18–19; *Sib. Or.* 3.27–33; 5.75–80, 276–280; Philo, *Decal.* 76–80; *Legat.* 139. Cf. also Clement, *Paed.* 3.2; Tertullian, *Nat.* 2.8.

Implicit and Explicit Cultic Conflation

Implicit Cultic Conflation in *Letter of Aristeas* 128–71

One of the ways Egyptians displayed reverence for animals was, in fact, through their food taboos.²⁹ Animal reverence, however, was decidedly not a rationale for Jewish abstention. Nonetheless, owing to confusion, theriolatrous motives were, at times, imputed to Jewish practice. Cultic conflation along these lines is implicit in Eleazar's apology for the Law in *Letter of Aristeas* 128–71. Addressed to the curiosity that “most men feel ... concerning passages in the law dealing with food and drink and animals regarded as unclean” (*Let. Aris.* 128),³⁰ this apology presents an interpretation of Jewish foods laws that associates clean animals with behaviors/actions to be emulated and unclean animals with behaviors/actions to be avoided.³¹ In providing the initial framework for his interpretation, Eleazar contrasts Jewish monotheism (cf. esp. *Let. Aris.* 132; Deut 6:4) with polytheism (*Let. Aris.* 134) and euhemeristic idolatry (*Let. Aris.* 135–37). As for theriolatry, Eleazar dismisses the subject as not worthy of discussion: “What need even to speak of other infatuated people, Egyptians and their like, who have put their reliance in wild beasts and most creeping creatures and animals, and worship these, and to these offer sacrifice, whether alive or dead?” (*Let. Aris.* 138).

²⁹ So M. A. L. Beavis, “Anti-Egyptian Polemic in the Letter of Aristeas 130–165 (The High Priest’s Discourse),” *JSJ* 18 (1987): 145–51[150]; Barclay, “Politics of Contempt,” 116–17.

³⁰ Translation from Moses Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951), 153. Subsequent references to *Letter of Aristeas*, whether translation or text, are from Hadas.

³¹ Among Christian writings, *Barnabas*, for example, displays a similar approach to scriptural interpretation.

Eleazar's harsh dismissal, however, masks considerable concern. This concern is reflected in *Let. Aris.* 143–44. Promising to explain the “profound logic” (λόγον βαθύν) behind Jewish food taboos, Eleazar begins not with a positive presentation of this logic but rather with the following warning: “Do not accept the exploded idea that it was out of regard [χάρτιν] for ‘mice’ and the ‘weasel’ and other such creatures that Moses ordained these laws with such scrupulous care....” As M. A. L. Beavis observes, “The high priest’s words imply that the Jews have been accused of holding certain animals in special ‘favour’ (*charis*) because of their refusal to eat them”; especially given that, “To an outside observer, Jewish abstinence ... would have looked much like Egyptian ‘regard’ for ‘cats, dogs, and ibises.’”³² Beavis even suggests, “This is perhaps the kind of view of the relation between Jews and Egyptians that Eleazar’s discourse was designed to refute.”³³

Explicit Cultic Conflation in Plutarch, *Quaestionum convivialum libri IX* 4.5

The cultic conflation that is implicit in *Let. Aris.* 143–44 becomes explicit in Plutarch’s *Quaestiones convivales* 4.5.1–3 (669e–671c), a work known in English as

³² Beavis, “Anti-Egyptian,” 150. Commenting on the words in quotes, Beavis (*ibid.*, 150, n. 19, italics in original) notes that “Artapanus lists these three animals as ‘gods’ *ordained by Moses for the Egyptians* (in Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelium* 9:27).” See also Katell Berthelot, “The Use of Greek and Roman Stereotypes of the Egyptians by Hellenistic Jewish Apologists, with special reference to Josephus’ *Against Apion*,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium, Aarhus 1999* (ed. Jürgen U. Kalms; Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 6; Münster: LIT, 2000), 185–221[211–212].

³³ Beavis, “Anti-Egyptian,” 150, n. 19.

Table Talk.³⁴ Frieda Klotz and Katerina Oikonomopoulou provide a helpful description of this work:³⁵

The *Table Talk* is a collection of sympotic dialogues, dedicated by Plutarch to his Roman friend and patron Sossius Senecio (612c). It features him as a character, alongside members of his family, friends, teachers, pupils, and a broad and lively circle of often illustrious acquaintances. The subject of the dialogues is intellectual inquiry: each presents different characters (usually two or three) offering alternative explanations for a specific intellectual problem ... which derives more or less intrinsically from the immediate reality of social interaction.

Quaest. conv. 4.5 begins with Callistratus picking up on an earlier anecdote from Lamprias (*Quaest. conv.* 4.4.4 [669c]), Plutarch's brother. Callistratus asks, "What do you think of the assertion that it is precisely the most proper type of meat that the Jews avoid eating?" Expressing hearty agreement, Polycrates poses a related query, "[D]o they [Jews] abstain from eating pork by reason of some special respect [τιμῇ τινι] for hogs or from abhorrence of the creature?" In Polycrates' opinion, Jewish accounts sound like myth and he wonders whether "they have some serious reasons which they do not publish." Responding to the query, Callistratus says:

My impression ... is that the beast enjoys a certain respect [τινα τιμὴν] among that folk; granted that he is ugly and dirty, still he is no more absurd in appearance or crude in disposition than dung-beetle, field-mouse, crocodile, or cat, each of which is treated as sacred [ἁγιοτάτοις] by a different group of Egyptian priests.

Callistratus' response continues. He suggests that "the pig is honoured [τιμᾶσθαι] for a good reason," namely its agricultural contributions. The pig was "the first to cut the soil with its projecting snout, thus producing a furrow and teaching man the function of a

³⁴ On *Quaest. conv.* 4.5 (669e–671c), see Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1.545–46. On the date of Plutarch's *Quaestiones convivales*, probably early second century CE, see *ibid.*, 1.545, n. 2.

³⁵ Frieda Klotz and Katerina Oikonomopoulou, "Introduction," in *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire* (ed. Freida Klotz and Katerina Oikonomopoulou; Oxford: Oxford University, 2011), 1–31[1–2].

ploughshare”; and, for the Egyptians, who “cultivate the soft soil of their low-lying areas” and thus “have no use for ploughing at all,” pigs inculcated the art of sowing through overturning Nile-soaked earth with their hooves to plant seeds in the ground. Then, following comparison with and discussion of Egyptian theriolatrous practice, such as “deification” (ἐκθειάζω) of the field-mouse, Callistratus concludes his remarks with this observation:

Perhaps it is consistent that they [Jews] should *revere* [σέβεσθαι] *the pig who taught them sowing and plowing*, inasmuch as *they honour* [τιμῶσιν] *the ass who first led them to a spring of water*. Otherwise, so help me, someone will say that the Jews abstain from the hare because they can’t stomach anything so filthy and unclean.

The imputation of Egyptian rationales to Jewish praxis is evident throughout these remarks by Callistratus. Three points are especially important. First, abstention from pork is taken as an indication that Jews revere the animal.³⁶ Second, attributing reverence for a certain animal to that animal’s utility, such as the pig’s agricultural contributions, is one of the ways Egyptians justified theriolatry.³⁷ It is only natural, then, that Callistratus would assume the same holds true for Jews. Moreover, Diodorus Siculus’ explanation of Egyptian reverence for the cow along these lines proves significant. As his first example to illustrate the same utilitarian justification of theriolatry, Diodorus says, “The cow [τὴν ... θήλειαν βοῦν] ... bears workers and *ploughs* the lighter soil” (1.87.2). The association of *ploughing* with both the pig, by Plutarch (via Callistratus), and the cow, by Diodorus, implies a certain degree of fluidity in theriolatrous rationales. This fluidity is significant

³⁶ See also the reference to Jewish worship of the pig (Iudaeus licet et porcinum numen adoret) in Petronius, frg. 37. Cf. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1.444.

³⁷ Cf. Diodorus Siculus, 1.87.1–89.3; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 74–75 (380f–382a).

because it suggests that stories about adoration of a calf idol from Israel's own scriptures, once in circulation, could reinforce, if not become conflated with, libels about Jewish ass-worship.

That brings us to the third important point. Callistratus' comparison between pig-reverence and honoring "the ass who first led them to a spring of water"—likely a development from the reference to a herd of wild asses in Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2–3 (cf. p. 368)—shows how widespread the golden ass libel, with its attendant Typhonian associations (when recognized), had become. Indeed, Lamprias' subsequent comments, which conclude *Quaest. conv.* 4.5, provide ample corroboration for this point. In the process of proposing that Jews abstain from pork out of fear of contracting leprosy (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4, cited on p. 367) and then later for mythological reasons, Lamprias responds to Callistratus' final reference to abstention from the hare as follows:

No indeed ... they [Jews] abstain from the hare because of its *very close resemblance to the ass which they prize so highly*. The hare appears to be *simply an ass inferior in bulk and size*; for its coat, ears, bright eyes, and salacity are amazingly similar, so much so that nothing small ever so closely resembled something large. Perhaps, to be sure, *following the Egyptians even in their conception of traits of animals*, they regard the swiftness of the creature and the keenness of its senses as something divine.

So ingrained had the libel of ass-worship become that Lamprias employs this libel to explain another food taboo attributed to Jews. In so doing, he even suggests that Jews owe their understanding of animal traits to the Egyptians. This is yet another piece of evidence for confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire, confusion that extended even to the cultic realm.³⁸

³⁸ In fact, the mythological explanation provided by Lamprias in *Quaest. conv.* 4.5.3 (671b–c) may also be indirectly tied to the charge that Jews engaged in theriolatry. In addition to the fear of contracting

Calf Exclusion/Inclusion

Calf Exclusion in Josephus

In his treatise *Against Apion*, one of Josephus' primary aims was to dispel the confusion and resultant cultic conflation between Jews and Egyptians. As Barclay observes, "His rhetoric displays an almost frantic concern to place as clear a distinction as possible between 'Egyptian' and 'Judaean' [or Jew]." ³⁹ This concern is reflected in: repeated denials that Jews are originally Egyptian in ancestry (1.104–05, 252, 278; 2.8, 28–32, 289) including an extended critique of ethnographic models along these lines (*Ag. Ap.* 1.219–320); the insistence of a stark contrast between Jewish monotheism and Egyptian theriolatry (*Ag. Ap.* 1.223–26; 2.65–67, 128–29); and finally vehement refutation of the golden ass libel (2.80–88, 112–120).

leprosy, Lamprias attributes Jewish abstention from pork to the tradition that Adonis, whom people hold to be Dionysus "is said to have been slain by the boar [ὑπὸ τοῦ συός]." As the conversation continues in *Quaest. conv.* 4.6 (671c–72c), the figure of Moeragenes endorses and argues for the implication of Lamprias' comment that Dionysus is also to be equated with the Jewish god. The logic of Lamprias' mythological explanation would then appear to be that Jews abstain from pork out of abhorrence for the animal that killed the god (Adonis/Dionysus) whom they also revere. When one further recalls that Osiris, whose bodily image the Apis bull expresses, is yet another god identified with Dionysus (cf. n. 17), the theriolatrous groundwork is laid. Jewish abhorrence of the pig, it could be claimed, ultimately reflects reverence for a god who takes the form of a bull. Perhaps this line of reasoning was one of the many relevant proofs that, according to Moeragenes, could "lawfully be pronounced or divulged only to those" who had been "initiated into the Perfect Mysteries celebrated every other year" (*Quaest. conv.* 4.6.1 [671d]). Whether or not that is the case, Philo, as we shall see (cf. pp. 382ff.), repeatedly identifies adoration of the golden calf with Apis worship.

³⁹ Barclay, "Politics of Contempt," 113, material in brackets mine. As Barclay (*ibid.*, 111, 112, n. 9, 116) himself observes, there are two exceptions. One is the positive association of Jews with Egyptian historiography (*Ag. Ap.* 1.6–56) and the other is the comparison between Jewish circumcision and abstention from pork with practice of the same rites by Egyptian priests, whom Josephus regards as "most wise and pious [σοφωτάτους καὶ θεοσεβεῖς]" (*Ag. Ap.* 2.137–44). Ironically, the latter comparison, employed in the service of indicting Apion, "bears testimony to, and unwittingly reinforces, the common perception of 'Judaean' as 'Egyptian'." Ernst Bammel ("Das Judentum als eine Religion Ägyptens," in *Religion im Erbe Ägyptens: Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte zu Ehren von Alexander Böhlig* [Manfred Görg; Ägypten und Altes Testament 14; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1988], 1–10) provides an interesting discussion of evidence in Second Temple Jewish sources for a conciliatory approach to relations with Egypt, one that may have arisen in the Ptolemaic period at Leontopolis.

Josephus' concern to distinguish between Jews and Egyptians must be borne in mind when analyzing his two other major works: *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities*. Although at one point in *J. W.* 1.190 Josephus refers to "Egyptian Jews" (Ἰουδαῖοι Αἰγύπτιοι), his awareness of Jew–Egyptian confusion is evident in *Ant.* 2.177. Against an initial inclination otherwise, Josephus decides to recount all seventy of Jacob's descendants who departed from Egypt. Why? In order, he says, "to confute those persons who imagine us to be not of Mesopotamian origin but Egyptians...." This statement shows that Josephus' sensitivity to questions of Jewish and Egyptian identity was not limited to *Against Apion*, his final treatise, but was operative already in the earlier *Jewish Antiquities*.⁴⁰

It is precisely such sensitivity, I suggest, that played a role in Josephus' decision to exclude the golden calf incident from *Antiquities*; this in spite of his promise that "The precise details of our Scripture records will ... be set forth, each in its place ... throughout this work, neither adding nor omitting anything" (1.17). Josephus' promise, of course, is one that he breaks in numerous other ways, both in terms of addition and omission.⁴¹ Moreover, many factors undoubtedly contributed to the decision to exclude the golden calf from *Antiquities*, such as the unflattering light this incident sheds on Aaron, the people as a whole, and even Moses, who smashes the covenant tablets out of anger. Nonetheless, especially in light of his refutation of the golden ass libel, it seems

⁴⁰ See also Barclay, "Politics of Contempt," 114, n. 10.

⁴¹ For an addition, see e.g. the account of Moses the general defeating the Ethiopians and marrying an Ethiopian princess (*Ant.* 2.238–253). Besides the calf incident, Josephus omits e.g. mention of Reuben lying with his father's concubine Bilhah. Other embarrassing episodes omitted by Josephus are listed in Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley: University of California, 1998), 37–38.

reasonable to suppose that one of the reasons Josephus excluded the golden calf from *Antiquities* is that he feared recounting this incident would exacerbate the already widespread tendency to associate Jews with theriolatrous Egyptians.⁴²

Additionally, one may speculate that Egyptian worship of the Apis bull figured into Josephus' decision. In the context of recounting and then critiquing Manetho's slanderous version of the Exodus, Josephus twice mentions the Apis bull (*Ag. Ap.* 1.246, 263). Given, then, Josephus' knowledge of this well-documented aspect of Egyptian theriolatry, it seems likely that he would have also wanted to avoid the inevitable association of Jews with Apis worship that would have come as a result of including the golden calf incident in *Antiquities*. Indeed, a cursory comparison between the biblical accounts of the calf (Exod 32–34; Deut 9:7–10:11) and the Apis ceremony in Diodorus Siculus 1.85.1–5 (cf. p. 372), shows striking similarities: veneration of a “calf” (μόσχος), whether molten or living (Diodorus 1.85.1, 2; Exod 32:4, 8, 19, 20, 24, 35; Deut 9:21), as a god or gods (Diodorus 1.85.2; Exod 32:1, 4, 8, 23, 31), and this in relation to a forty-day period (Diodorus 1.85.2, 3; Exod 24:18; 34:28; Deut 9:9, 11, 18, 25; 10:10).⁴³

⁴² Paul Spilsbury (“*Contra Apionem* and *Antiquitates Judaicae*: Points of Contact,” in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* [ed. Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison; AGJU 34; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 348–68[355]) and Louis H. Feldman (“Philo’s Account of the Golden Calf Incident,” *JJS* 56 [2005]: 245–64[246–47]) attribute Josephus’ exclusion of the golden calf incident from *Antiquities*, at least in part, to sensitivities arising from circulation of the golden ass libel.

⁴³ Although the forty-day periods in Exodus and Deuteronomy concern Moses’ reception of the Law and later intercession, Exod 32:6, 18 depict the Israelites, during the first forty-day period, as engaged in festal celebration. It is this celebration that bears a resemblance to the forty-day period of festivities associated with the installation of a new bull in Diodorus 1.85.1–5.

Calf Inclusion in Philo

Whether or not similarities with Apis worship figured into Josephus' decision to exclude the golden calf from *Antiquities*, they certainly figure into the manner in which Philo includes this incident in his *On the Life of Moses* (Latin title: *De vita Mosis*) and in his other references as well.⁴⁴ *On the Life of Moses* is a biography organized according to Moses' fourfold role as king (1.5–334), lawgiver (2.8–65), high priest (2.66–186), and prophet (2.187–291). On two separate occasions in this biography, Philo includes an account of the golden calf incident. Interestingly, neither occurs in association with Moses' role as lawgiver, even though Israel's reception of the Law is the context for the biblical versions (Exod 32–34; Deut 9:7–10:11). Instead, one occurs in relation to Moses as high priest (2.161–73) and the other in relation to Moses as prophet (2.270–74). Both of these Philonic accounts emphasize the Levites' positive response to Moses' request for those on the LORD's side to come to him and their heroic fidelity in slaying three thousand fellow Israelites, for which they were elected to the priesthood (cf. Exod 32:26–29; Deut 9:8–9; *Mos.* 2.168, 170–73, 272–74).⁴⁵ What is significant, for our purposes, is that Philo identifies the instigators of the golden calf incident as those overcome by Egyptian impulses, specifically the lure of Apis worship.⁴⁶ Table 47 reproduces Philo's references to these *idolatrours/theriolatrours Israelites* in *Mos.* 2.161–73, 270–74:

⁴⁴ For an introduction to Philo, see Kenneth L. Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005).

⁴⁵ For further detailed comparison between Philo on the golden incident and the biblical as well as extra-biblical accounts, see Feldman, "Philo's," 245–64.

⁴⁶ Viewed in light of the strong Philonic evidence (to follow) for associating the golden calf with Egyptian idolatry/theriolatry, the statement ἐστράφησαν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον in Acts 7:39, which introduces Stephen's rehearsal of the golden calf incident (Acts 7:40–43), seems to reflect a similar

Table 47. Theriolatrous Israelites in *Mos.* 2.161–62, 169, 270

¹⁶¹ ... οἱ μὴ βέβαιοι τὰς φύσεις, ὥσπερ ἀναρχίας γενομένης, ἄφετοι πρὸς ἀσέβειαν ὥρμησαν καὶ ἐκλαθόμενοι τῆς πρὸς τὸ ὄν ὁσιότητος ζηλωταὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν γίνονται πλάσμάτων. ¹⁶² εἶτα χρυσοῦν ταῦρον κατασκευασάμενοι, μίμημα τοῦ κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἱερωτάτου ζώου δοκοῦντος εἶναι, θυσίας ἀθύτους ἀνῆγον....	¹⁶¹ ... [M]en of unstable nature ... rushed into impious practices <i>unrestrainedly</i> , as though authority ceased to be, and, forgetting the reverence they owed to the Self-Existent, became zealous devotees of Egyptian fables. ¹⁶² Then, having fashioned a golden bull , in imitation of the animal held most sacred in that country, they offered up sacrifices which were no sacrifices....
¹⁶⁹ τῶν μὲν οὖν ἄλλων οἱ μὲν ἔνεκα τοῦ τὸν Αἰγυπτιακὸν ἐζηλωκέναι τύφον ἀφηνιάζοντες οὐ προσεῖχον τοῖς λεγομένοις....	¹⁶⁹ Of the rest, some, whom devotion to the vanity of Egypt <i>had made rebellious</i> , paid no heed to his words....
²⁷⁰ ... ἡνίκα τεκτηνάμενοι ταῦρον χρυσοῦν, Αἰγυπτιακοῦ μίμημα τύφου....	²⁷⁰ ... [W]hen, after fashioning a golden bull in imitation of the vanity of Egypt....

The degree to which these instigators have been affected and even transformed by their own idolatrous/theriolatrous impulses is suggested by the italicized words, ἄφετος and ἀφηνιάζω. With regard to the latter, I noted in chapter five that ἀφηνιάζω means “refuse to obey the rein” and that Philo employs the cognate term ἀφηνιαστής (“refusing the rein”) in *Spec.* 1.304 as part of a golden calf evocation in which he depicts animal-like Israelites, who “on account of hardness of ways refuse the rein, leaping stubbornly and flailing their heads about” (my trans.). Similarly, in relation to the former, Louis H. Feldman observes:⁴⁷

[T]he very word (ἄφετοι) that Philo uses to describe the Israelites’ lack of restraint is a word that means ‘letting loose’ and is employed especially with regard to sacred flocks that are free from work and that range at large at pasture,

understanding. In other words, “they turned in their hearts to Egypt” implies the desire to engage in theriolatrous worship of a calf-idol, representative of the gods who will go before Israel into the Land.

⁴⁷ Feldman, “Philo’s,” 251. Feldman (ibid, 251, n. 16) lists parallel uses of ἄφετος in Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 666; Plato, *Critias* 119d; *Protagoras* 320a; *Republic* 6.498c; Isocrates 5.127; Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos* 36.

like animals—a clear allusion to the fact that they are building and worshipping an animal, namely a calf (bull) that roams at large.

These Israelite instigators, in short, have become like that which they worship. As for the object of their emulation, Feldman’s dual reference to a “calf (bull)” reflects Philo’s implicit identification of the golden calf incident as an episode of Apis worship. Even though the biblical accounts consistently utilize the word μόσχος (“calf”) to describe the form of the molten-idol,⁴⁸ Philo (see the bold script in table 47) refers to this molten-idol as a ταῦρος (“bull”), the same term applied to the adult Apis in Diodorus Siculus 1.85.1 (cf. p. 372).⁴⁹ This bull, according to Philo in *Mos.* 2.162, was the “animal held most sacred” in Egypt and one whose allurements proved too powerful for a certain segment of Israel.

Other references in the Philonic corpus, three of which use the term ταῦρος (“bull”), confirm his implicit identification of the golden calf incident as an episode of Apis worship, in particular, and of Egyptian theriolatrous idolatry, in general. These passages are as follows:

Table 48. Six Other References to the Golden Calf as Egyptian Theriolatry in Philo

<i>Sacr.</i> 130	ὅτε γοῦν ἡ ψυχὴ τραπεῖσα τὸν Αἰγύπτιον θεόν, τὸ σῶμα, ὡς χρυσὸν ἐξετίμησε....	We find that when the soul fell and honoured the god of Egypt, the body, as gold....
<i>Post.</i> 158	... ὁ χρυσοῦς μόσχος, τὸ Αἰγυπτίων ἀφίδρυμα, τὸ σῶμα....	...the golden calf, the idol of the Egyptians, which is the body....
<i>Ebr.</i> 95	... ὡς θεοπλαστεῖν μὲν τὸ σῶμα, θεοπλαστεῖν δὲ τὸν παρ’	And thus he made a god of the body, a god of the vanity most honoured

⁴⁸ Cf. Exod 32:4, 8, 19, 20, 24, 35; Deut 9:21; Neh 9:18 [2 Esdras 19:18]; Ps 106(105):19–20; Acts 7:41 (μοσχοποιέω). Cf. also *1 Clem.* 52.2; *Barn.* 8.2. See, however, 1 Kgs [3 Kgdms] 12:28, 32, which use δάμαλις instead to refer to Jeroboam’s “heifers.”

⁴⁹ See also Feldman, “Philo’s,” 251–52.

	Αἰγυπτίοις μάλιστα τιμώμενον τύφον, οὗ σύμβολον ἢ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ταύρου κατασκευή....	among the Egyptians, whose symbol is the image of the golden bull .
<i>Fug.</i> 90	... τοὺς θεοπλαστήσαντας τὸν χρυσοῦν μόσχον, τὸν Αἰγυπτιακὸν τύφον....	... those who fashioned into a god the golden calf, the Egyptian folly....
<i>Spec.</i> 1.79	... καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἔδοξεν ἡ πληθὺς ἁμαρτεῖν ἀπακολουθήσασα γνώμας ἐνίων ἀγνώμοσιν, οἱ τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν ἔπεισαν ζηλοῦν ἡλιθιότητα καὶ τὸν ἐγχώριον τύφον, ὃν ἐπ' ἀλόγοις ζώοις καὶ μάλιστα ταύροις μυθοπλαστοῦσι....	... on an occasion when the multitude was seen to have fallen into sin through following the ill-judgement of some who persuaded them to emulate the foolishness of Egypt and the vainly imagined fables current in the land, attached to irrational animals and especially to bulls .
<i>Spec.</i> 3.125	... ταῦρον δὲ κατασκευασάμενοι χρυσοῦν, Αἰγυπτιακοῦ μίμημα τύφου....	... constructed a golden bull in imitation of the vanity of Egypt....

Assuming that Egyptian theriolatry, especially Apis worship, and libels circulating about Jewish ass-worship figured into Josephus' decision to exclude the golden calf incident out fear of exacerbating Greco-Roman tendencies to confuse Jews with Egyptians, it is interesting to observe that Philo reflects similar apologetic concerns. The difference is that Philo opted to include two accounts of the golden calf incident in his biography of Moses and refer to it in his other works as well but to do so by blaming *instigation* of the incident on a restricted segment of Israel, namely those who had been overcome by Apis worship and more generally Egyptian theriolatrous idolatry (cf. esp. *Spec.* 1.79 in table 48).

Moreover, even as Philo chronicles the spread of the golden calf transgression to the multitude (*Mos.* 2.166), he is also careful to draw distinctions within that multitude. In *Mos.* 2.169, Philo explains that while some failed to heed Moses' call to come to him (cf. Exod 32:26; *Mos.* 2.168) because of their devotion to Egyptian vanity (i.e.,

theriolatrous idolatry), others did not respond “possibly in fear of chastisement ... either because they feared the vengeance they might suffer at the hand of Moses or the onslaught of an insurgent mob.” Philo’s willingness to engage in speculation regarding the motives of the latter group suggests that his primary concern is to draw a distinction that limits the spread of Egyptian vanity to only a select segment of the Israelite population.⁵⁰ According to *Mos.* 2.274, it is especially this segment of the population whom the Levites attacked: “So they slaughtered three thousand of the principal leaders in godlessness, without meeting any resistance” (οἱ δ’ αὐτοβοεῖ τρισχιλίους κτείναντες τοὺς ἀρχηγέτας μάλιστα τῆς ἀσεβείας γενομένου).⁵¹ And *Sacr.* 130 even says that the Levites thereby “made an end of *all* the ... doctrines of their enemies” (πάντα τὰ τῶν ἐναντιουμένων δόγματα καταλῦσαι). The implication is that, thanks to the Levites, Israel was purged of Egyptian vanity, that is, the theriolatrous idolaters responsible for constructing the golden calf/bull.

If this interpretation of Philo is correct, then the manner in which he includes the golden calf incident proves no less apologetic than Josephus’ decision to exclude it. At the very least, the treatment (or non-treatment) by these two authors, combined with widespread confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians in the Roman Empire, confusion that extended to the cultic realm, shows how sensitive and thus easily evoked a subject the golden calf incident would have been *within* the Jewish community. Indeed, it appears that different understandings of this incident along with alternate

⁵⁰ See also the distinctions drawn in *Spec.* 1.79; 3.125–27.

⁵¹ Similarly, *Fug.* 90 refers to the slaughter of those who made the golden calf, though an allegorical interpretation immediately follows.

understandings of Jewish identity formed a particular conversation to which Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106) bear striking, even if subtle, witness. That, at any rate, is the next component of the sketch I shall explore.

**Particular Conversation: Differing Understandings of Jewish Identity in
Wisdom of Solomon 11–19 and Psalms 105(104)–107(106)**

The preceding section provided evidence for general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians within the Roman Empire. The general confusion was due to three factors: shared customs, specifically circumcision and the food taboo of pork abstention; various ethnographic models that traced Jewish origins to Egypt; and the libel that the Jews kept the head of a golden ass in the Temple. Whether or not the Typhonian associations related to the golden ass libel were recognized, this third factor, in combination with the other two, created confusion that extended to the cultic realm, as the theriolatrous motives of Egyptians were ascribed to Jewish praxis (cf. *Let. Aris.* 144; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 4.5). Such cultic conflation made the golden calf incident a sensitive subject among Diaspora Jews, especially in view of its similarities to Apis worship. Indeed, Josephus excludes the golden calf from his *Jewish Antiquities*, while Philo, though including the calf in *On the Life of Moses* and mentioning it elsewhere, presents an apologetic construal, associating the incident with the Levites' election to the priesthood and attributing worship of the calf to those who were led astray by Egyptian vanity, specifically Apis worship. Philo's approach, however, concedes that the golden calf incident is a moment in Israel's history in which at least some among her behaved like Egyptian animal worshipers.

The present section takes for granted the social significance of the golden calf in terms of Jewish–Egyptian relations and suggests that this incident may have figured prominently in a particular conversation concerning the different understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106). The contours of this conversation will be traced by examining these textual complexes, including their interrelationship. Toward that end, this section is divided into five subsections. The first provides an overview of the structure and apologetically-oriented hermeneutical stance toward the Pentateuch in Wis 11–19 before analyzing chapters 13–15 with attention to the implicit interpretation of the calf in 15:1–6. The second subsection, in turn, provides an overview of Ps 105(104) before comparing it to Wis 11–19. This comparison shows that both hermeneutically and constitutively Wis 11–19 was either inspired by, or at least is reminiscent of, Ps 105(104), especially vv. 23–41. Ps 105(104), in other words, serves as the substructure of Wis 11–19.

Yet, in order to serve as the substructure for Wis 11–19, Ps 105(104) had to be abstracted from its canonical position as the lead member of a psalmic trilogy. Proving this point is the subject of the next two subsections. Thus the third subsection elucidates the pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration in Pss 105(104)–107(106), while the fourth compares this pattern to Wis 11–19, outlining the antithetical parallels with Ps 106(105) that result. In each antithetical parallel, whereas Wisdom omits or mitigates the motif of Israelite rebellion, Ps 106(105) focuses upon it. The fifth subsection then concludes by proposing that these textual similarities and differences may have given rise to an intra-Jewish debate between Hellenistic and Restoration-oriented understandings of

Jewish identity. As we shall see, these alternate notions of Jewish identity are accompanied by, if not entail, distinct approaches to incidents like the golden calf. In the final section, I explore the possibility that Rom 1:18–2:11, a text in which evocations of the calf play a prominent role, reflects Paul’s participation in, and even exploitation of, an intra-Jewish debate like the one I have proposed. We now begin with Wis 11–19.

Wisdom of Solomon 11–19⁵²

Overview of Wisdom of Solomon 11–19: Structure and Hermeneutics

Wis 11–19, the third and final part of the book, utilizes pentateuchal material from the plague accounts and wilderness wanderings to construct seven contrasts between the LORD’s provision/mercy for the Israelites versus his punishment of the Egyptians.⁵³ These contrasts may be represented as follows:

- I. Water from Rock vs. Plague of Nile Water to Blood (11:1–14; cf. Exod 7:14–25; 17:1–7; Num 20:1–13)
- II. Animal Plagues vs. Provision of Quail (11:15–16:4; cf. Exod 8:1–9:7; 10:1–20 16:1–36; Num 11:4–35)
 - A. Introduction (11:15–16)
 - B. Excursus: LORD’s Mercy Illustrated with Canaanites (11:17–12:22)
 - C. Resumption (12:23–27)

⁵² Portions of this subsection appeared previously in Alec J. Lucas, “Unearthing an Intra-Jewish Interpretive Debate? Romans 1:18–2:4; Wisdom of Solomon 11–19; and Psalms 105(104)–107(106),” *Annali di Storia dell’Esegesi* 27 (2010): 69–91[82–91]; idem, “Distinct Portraits and Parallel Development of the Knowledge of God in Romans 1:18–32 and Wisdom of Solomon 13–15,” in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood* (ed. Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson; WUNT 284; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 61–82[65–71].

⁵³ There is debate about where to begin this last section of Wisdom (10:1; 11:1; 11:2; or 11:5). On the structure of Wisdom, see Michael Kolarcik, *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1–6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation* (AnBib 127; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 1–28; Maurice Gilbert, “The Literary Structure of the Book of Wisdom. A Study of Various Views,” in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2005; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 19–32. For a general introduction to Wisdom, see Lester L. Grabbe, *Wisdom of Solomon* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997).

D. Excursus: Aberrant Forms of Worship (13:1–15:19)

E. Conclusion (16:1–4)

- III. LORD's Mercy in Serpent Judgment vs. Plagues of Locusts and Flies (16:5–14; cf. Exod 8:20–32; 10:1–20; Num 21:4–9)
- IV. Plague of Fiery Hail vs. Provision of Manna (16:15–29; cf. Exod 9:13–35; 16:1–36; Num 11:4–35)
- V. Plague of Darkness on Egypt vs. Pillar of Fire for Israel (17:1–18:4; cf. Exod 10:21–29; 13:17–22; 14:19–25; Num 14:13–16; Deut 1:33)
- VI. Plague on Egyptian Firstborn vs. Plague on Israel for Korah's Rebellion (18:5–25; cf. Exod 11:1–10; 12:29–30; Num 16:1–17:13)
- VII. Red Sea Crossing: Salvation for Israel and Judgment upon Egyptians (19:1–22; cf. Exod 13:17–15:21)

The first contrast in Wis 11:1–14 is the simplest. The LORD's provision of water for Israel from a rock is contrasted with his turning the Nile water into blood to punish the Egyptians. Conversely, the second contrast in Wis 11:15–16:4, which concerns the animal plagues upon the Egyptians versus the provision of quail for the Israelites, is the most complex. This contrast opens with the statement that “in place of their [the Egyptians'] senseless, wicked reasoning” (ἀντὶ δὲ λογισμῶν ἀσυνέτων ἀδικίας αὐτῶν), which led them to worship “irrational” (ἄλογος) serpents and worthless animals, the LORD sent a multitude of “irrational” (ἄλογος) creatures for vengeance (Wis 11:15).⁵⁴ These animal plagues come about so that the Egyptians, not to mention the readers of Wisdom, would know that one is punished by the things through which he or she sins (Wis 11:16), a principle so important that it finds expression in five of Wisdom's seven

⁵⁴ Smelik and Hemelrijk (“‘Who Knows’,” 1914) note that the author of Wisdom “did not appear to notice or to consider significant the fact that it is mostly animals which were not worshipped by the Egyptians that played a part in the stories about the plagues.”

contrasts.⁵⁵ Yet, in spite of this principle, the apparent harshness of the verdict occasions two excursions, one on the LORD's mercy illustrated in judgment of the Canaanites (Wis 11:17–12:22) and the other, after a brief resumption of the animal-plagues judgment (Wis 12:23–27), on deviant forms of Gentile worship (Wis 13:1–15:19). As Maurice Gilbert notes, “[T]he second digression will show that the animal worship practiced in Egypt is the worst of the religious aberrations.”⁵⁶ Once this second excursus is complete, the contrast then concludes with an account of the provision of quail for Israel, comparing it to the privation of the Egyptians, a privation effected by the appetite-suppressing appearance of the animals sent upon them (Wis 16:1–4). In terms of complexity, the rest of the contrasts fall in between these extremes of the first and second.

Significantly, the author's interpretation of the Pentateuch throughout chapters 11–19 is highly tendentious. For instance, he suppresses the motifs of rebellion and immoderate desire that characterize the biblical account of quail in Numbers (Wis 16:1–4; 19:11–12; Num 11:4–35) and performs a similar hermeneutic of suppression in relation to manna (Wis 16:15–29; Exod 16:1–36).⁵⁷ With the possible exceptions of the

⁵⁵ Michael Kolarcik (“The Book of Wisdom: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 5 [ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997], 528–29; cf. 443–46, 449–50) observes: “Exegetes have noticed two organizing features for the author's interpretation of the plagues associated with the exodus.... One is a system of [seven] antitheses that compare and contrast the Egyptian punishments with Israel's blessings. This system follows a moral principle enunciated in 11:5, 13.... The other system consists of five diptychs that draw a parallel between Egypt's sins and the ensuing punishments of the plagues. This system follows the moral principle enunciated in 11:16....” See especially the comparative chart on p. 446.

⁵⁶ “[L]a deuxième digression montrera que la zoolâtrie pratiquée en Égypte est la pire des aberrations religieuses,” “La connaissance de Dieu selon le Livre de la Sagesse,” in *La Notion biblique de Dieu: Le Dieu de la Bible et le Dieu des philosophes* (ed. J. Coppens; BETL 41; Leuven: Leuven University, 1976), 191–210[201].

⁵⁷ Cf. Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 398–99.

serpent judgment and Korah's rebellion (Wis 16:5–14; 18:20–25),⁵⁸ the following observation by Peter T. van Rooden holds true: "Israel in Wisdom is no longer a human community, as in Exodus, but a sinless fellowship of the saints."⁵⁹

Analysis of Wisdom of Solomon 13–15: Aberrant Worship and Calf Interpretation

Now that the structure and hermeneutics of Wis 11–19 are clear, we turn to analyze Wis 13–15, the excursus on aberrant forms of worship within the second contrast. I shall concentrate on the implicit interpretation of the calf in 15:1–6, since this interpretation figures prominently in the particular conversation being proposed and in Paul's exploitation of that conversation. With that in mind, our analysis begins with structure and content. Wis 13–15 takes the following form:⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Although the account of the serpent judgment in Wis 16:5–14 mentions God's ὀργή toward Israel (v. 5), the occasion for this wrath is omitted, the wrath does not last long, and the serpent bites *do not* result in death. Num 21:4–9, in contrast, highlights the occasion for God's wrath: Israel's offense at the perceived lack of provision by God and Israel's slanderous charge against God and Moses that they have been delivered into the desert to be slain. This charge then finds ironic fulfillment because the serpent bites *do* result in death for many Israelites. As for the account of Korah's rebellion in Wis 18:20–25, Joseph R. Dodson (*The 'Powers' of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans* [BZNW 2/161; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008], 96–97) highlights the personification of *wrath* in this text and argues that the phrase ἡ πείρα τῆς ὀργῆς (v. 25) should be understood as a subjective genitive with the result that it is *wrath*, not God, who tests Israel. Furthermore, the experience is not to be viewed as a punishment for Israel's sin but as a test which Israel passes, proving her holiness.

⁵⁹ "Israel ist in Sapientia nicht mehr das menschliche Volk wie in Exodus, sondern eine sündlose Gemeinschaft von Heiligen," "Die Antike Elementarlehre und der Aufbau von Sapientia Salomonis 11–19," in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram* (ed. J. W. van Henten, et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 81–96[88]. Similarly, Samuel Cheon (*The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* [JSPSup 23; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997], 151, italics mine) says of the author of Wisdom, "He interprets the biblical text concerning the *Israelites* and their Lord in a *positive way*, combining, contrasting and exaggerating narratives of the Exodus." See also Peter Enns (*Exodus Retold: Ancient Exegesis of the Departure from Egypt in Wis 10:15–21 and 19:1–9* [HSM 57; Atlanta: Scholars, 1997], 147–49) on Wis 10, in particular.

⁶⁰ Although based on my own analysis, this outline is indebted to Kolarcik, "Book of Wisdom," 446; and, in turn, to Maurice Gilbert, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13–15)* (AnBib 53; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1973), 245–57.

- A** (Greco-Roman) Deification of Divine Works (13:1–9)
- B** Human-made Idols: Carpenter and Wood (13:10–19)
- C** Reflection on God’s Saving Providence at Sea (14:1–8)
- D** Idolatry: Punishment, Etiology and Consequences, Punishment (14:9–31)
- C'** Reflection on God’s Mercy (15:1–6)
- B'** Human-made Idols: Potter and Clay (15:7–13)
- A'** (Egyptian) Idolatry and Theriolatry (15:14–19)

Although the concentric structure focuses attention on the central section (14:9–31), there is nonetheless progression throughout which highlights the comparative wickedness of Egyptian worship in relation to the veneration of divine and human works (13:1–9; 13:10–19; 15:7–13). On the one hand, the designations that commence each section clearly mark such progression: μάταιος (“vain”) for nature worship (13:1); ταλαίπωρος (“wretched”) for idolatry (13:10); and ἀφρονέστατος (“most foolish”) for the Egyptians (15:14).⁶¹ On the other hand, more subtle indicators appear as well. Idolatry, the worship of human art, is worse than nature veneration, the worship of divine art, a contrast underscored by several parallels in vocabulary.⁶² The Egyptians, in turn, are the most foolish because they are guilty of both idolatry (15:14–17) and theriolatry (15:18–19). The section on Egyptian idolatry, carefully crafted so as to recall the indictments of the carpenter and potter (13:10–19; 15:7–13),⁶³ suggests that all of the vitriol heaped on

⁶¹ So e.g., David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; Garden City: Doubleday, 1979), 248–49.

⁶² (1) Divine vs. Human ἐργ-: τοῖς ἔργοις [13:1]; ὁ γενεσιουργός [13:5]; τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ [13:7] vs. ἔργα χειρῶν and χειρὸς ἔργον [13:10]; ἐργασίας [13:12, 19]; (2) Divine vs. Human τεχ-: τεχνίτην (13:1) vs. τέχνης [13:10]; τεχνησάμενος [13:11]; (3) Divine vs. Human κατασκευάζω: ὁ κατασκευάσας [13:4] vs. κατασκεύασεν [13:11].

idolaters thus far holds for the Egyptians as well. In addition, however, the Egyptians also worship animals, even the most hateful among the animals (the most hateful because they are more “mindless” [ἄνοια] than the rest), animals so appalling that they have escaped the praise and blessing of God (15:18–19), a god who, earlier in the book, is said to love and not detest all of his creation (11:24–25).⁶⁴

The “Reflection on God’s Mercy” in Wis 15:1–6 comes after the central section (Wis 14:9–31), a description of the origin (14:15–21), outcome (14:12–14, 22–29), and punitive end of idolatry (14:9–11, 30–31). Regarding the outcome of idolatry, for example, this section says that the “intention” (ἐπίνοια) of making idols was the beginning of sexual immorality, their invention the corruption of life (14:12), and their worship the beginning, cause, and extremity of every evil (14:27), claims corroborated by a vice list (14:22–26). Wis 15:1–6, itself, is united and divided by vocabulary into two parts, vv. 1–3, and vv. 4–6.⁶⁵ Beginning with the latter, the author, identifying himself with Israel for the second time (cf. 15:1, 4; cf. also 12:6; 18:6), denies that “we Israelites” have been misled by the “intention of evil-art” (κακότεχνος ἐπίνοια), that is idolatry, or

⁶³ In relation to the carpenter: ἐποίησεν in 15:16 recalls ποιήσας (13:15; cf. also 14:8, 15); ἐργάζεται recalls ἐργασίας (13:12, 19; cf. also 14:8, 20); 15:15b is reminiscent of 13:16–19, especially περὶ δὲ ὁδοιπορίας τὸ μὴ δὲ βάσει χρῆσθαι δυνάμενον (13:18c) vs. οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἄργοι πρὸς ἐπίβασιν (15:15b); and the living-person/dead-idol irony of 15:17 is paralleled in 13:10, 17, 18 (cf. 14:15, 29). In relation to the potter: ἔπλασεν and πλάσαι in 15:16 recall πλάσσει, ἀνεπλάσατο (15:7); πλάσσει (15:8, 9; cf. also χαλκοπλάστας in 15:9); πλάσαντα; and the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα δεδανεισμένος in 15:16 is reminiscent of τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπαιτηθεὶς χρέος in 15:8.

⁶⁴ On this tension between Wis 11:24–25; 15:18–19, see Kolarcik, “Book of Wisdom,” 570.

⁶⁵ The passage as a whole is bound together by ἡμῶν (v. 1) and ἡμᾶς (v. 4). Verses 1–3 are united by: Σὺ (v. 1), σοί (2x, v. 2); ἀμάρτωμεν, ἀμαρτησόμεθα (v. 2); εἰδότες (2x, v. 2), εἰδέναι (v. 3); κράτος (vv. 2, 3); and verses 4–6 are united by κακότεχνος (v. 4), κακῶν (v. 6); εἶδος (vv. 4, 5), ποθεῖ (v. 5), ποθοῦντες (v. 6). In terms of relation to what precedes and follows, *mot-crochets* include: ἀμαρτανόντων (14:31), ἀμάρτωμεν, ἀμαρτησόμεθα (15:2); and ἡμῶν (15:1), ἡμᾶς (15:4), ἡμῶν (15:7), although the latter is not restricted to Israel as are the former two. Cf. Gilbert, *La Critique des Dieux*, 193–96, 198.

the fruitless toil of painters, a variegated image arousing desire only in fools who would long after an inanimate icon. This denial in vv. 4–5 and the subsequent denunciation of idolaters in v. 6 is composed of vocabulary and imagery dispersed throughout Wis 13–15, with ἐπίνοια serving as the most conspicuous example.⁶⁶ The effect is to disassociate Israel from the idolatry, immorality, and judgment that is the subject of the excursus.⁶⁷

David Winston attempts to mitigate the significance of this disassociation. He states, “The writer is thinking of his own period,” and then cites texts such as Jdt 8:18: “For never in our generation, nor in these present days, has there been any tribe or family or people or town of ours that worships gods made with hands, as was done in days gone by” (NRSV).⁶⁸ The problem with this parallel, in particular, is that Jdt 8:18 refers to Israel’s past problems with idolatry, even acknowledging in the next verse, “That was why our ancestors were handed over to the sword and to pillage, and so they suffered a great catastrophe before our enemies” (Jdt 8:19 NRSV). Given Israel’s repeated dalliances with idolatry chronicled in biblical and extra-biblical writings and the historically-oriented nature of Wisdom’s account, one may be excused for thinking that the author of Wisdom is being less than forthright.

⁶⁶ The other examples of vocabulary include: πλανάω (13:6; 14:22; 15:4); ἄνθρωπος (13:1, 10, 13; 14:5, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21; 15:4, 16[2x]); κακ- (14:22, 27, 29, 30; 15:4, 6, 8, 12, 18); τεχ- (13:1, 10, 11; 14:2, 4, 18, 19; 15:4); χρώα (13:14) and χρῶμα (15:4); ὄψις (13:7; 14:17[2x]; 15:5, 19); ἄφρων (14:11; 15:5, 14); ὀρεξίς (14:2; 15:5); νεκρός (13:10, 18; 14:15; 15:5, 17); εἰκόν (13:13, 16; 14:15, 17; 15:5); ἄξιος (13:15; 15:6); ἐλπίς (13:10; 14:6; 15:6, 10); δράω (14:10; 15:6); σεβ- (14:20; 15:6, 17, 18). For thematic parallels, see: 13:14 vs. 15:4; 14:18–21 vs. 15:5.

⁶⁷ Cf. Wis 14:11; 15:15. These two verses explicitly associate idolatry with the Gentiles and thus, implicitly, not with Israel.

⁶⁸ *Wisdom of Solomon*, 282.

Yet, such a judgment proves premature in light of the allusions that precede in Wis 15:1–3. The text begins with an address to ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (“our God”), who is χρηστός καὶ ἀληθής, μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα (“kind and true, patient and [the one] governing all things with mercy”). This address recalls the divine attributes revealed in the aftermath of the golden calf incident (cf. ἐλεήμων/πολυέλεος/ἔλεος, μακρόθυμος, ἀληθινός in Exod 34:6–7).⁶⁹ The author then states in Wis 15:2: καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ἀμάρτωμεν, σοὶ ἐσμεν, εἰδότες σου τὸ κράτος· οὐχ ἀμαρτησόμεθα δέ, εἰδότες ὅτι σοὶ λελογίσμεθα (“for even if we sin, we are yours, since we know your power; but we will not sin, since we know that we are reckoned to you”). In view of the evocation of Exod 34:6–7 and the prior use of the verb ἀμαρτάνω (“sin”) in Wis 14:31, these references to sin imply idolatry, specifically the golden calf incident.⁷⁰

Corroboration for discerning an allusion to the golden calf is found in the expression σοὶ ἐσμεν of Wis 15:2. This expression recalls the nearly identical phrase that concludes Exod 34:9.⁷¹ We saw in chapter four that in this verse Moses prays for the

⁶⁹ While the parallels between Wis 15:1 and Exod 34:6–7 are often noted (e.g., Winston, *Wisdom of Solomon*, 281; C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon* [Ebib 5; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1985], 3.847–48; Kolarcik, “Book of Wisdom,” 561; Helmut Engel, *Das Buch der Weisheit* [Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament 16; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998], 233; Giuseppe Scarpata, *Libro della Sapienza: Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento* [Biblica Testi e Studi 6; Brescia: Paideia, 1999], 3.152), Gilbert (*La Critique des Dieux*, 174–88) goes further, arguing that the renewal of the covenant in the aftermath of the golden calf incident is presupposed in Wis 15:1–2. This interpretation is similar to the one I propose, although mine was developed independently. More recently, John M. G. Barclay (“‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy’: The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism,” *Early Christianity* 1 [2010]: 82–106[90–91]) has also discussed the echoes of Exod 34 in Wis 15:1–2, suggesting that “*Wisdom of Solomon* has read the references to divine goodness and mercy in Exodus 34 without reference to their context as the aftermath to the Golden Calf apostasy.” Cf. Jonathan A. Linebaugh, “Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11,” *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–37[222].

⁷⁰ Cf. Gilbert, *La Critique des Dieux*, 181; Kolarcik, “Book of Wisdom,” 562.

⁷¹ So also Gilbert, *La Critique des Dieux*, 181–82; Winston, *Wisdom of Solomon*, 281; Engel, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, 234; Barclay, “‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy’,” 90.

LORD to accompany his λαός ... σκληροτράχηλος (“stiff-necked people”; a characterization, especially associated with the golden calf) and ideally to transform Israel, taking away their ἁμαρτία (“sin”) and ἀνομία (“lawlessness”) so that ἐσόμεθα σοί (“we will be yours”). Although Moses’ prayer never receives an explicit answer, it is followed by the LORD’s assurance that he will go with Israel, an assurance that in Exodus leads to the re-inscription of the covenant tablets and resolution of the golden calf crisis. The confident declaration in Wis 15:2 that “we will not sin” and the subsequent denial of complicity in contemporary idolatry suggests that the author of Wisdom regarded Moses’ prayer for Israelite transformation as having received a positive answer. Israel’s “stiff-necked” nature, her “sin” and “lawlessness,” had been removed. In other words, Wis 15:1–6 reflects an implicit interpretation of the golden calf incident as recounted in Exod 32–34, one that, like Wisdom’s hermeneutic throughout the seven contrasts, minimizes Israel’s sin. The origin of, or at least a biblical precedent for, Wisdom’s hermeneutic in Ps 105(104) is what we discuss next.

Psalm 105(104) as the Substructure of Wisdom of Solomon 11–19

As a prelude to engaging in comparison with Wis 11–19 and then later with Pss 106(105)–107(106), we first need to understand Ps 105(104) on its own terms. Thus the first part of this subsection provides an extensive overview of Ps 105(104), with attention to its structure and hermeneutics. The second part then compares Ps 105(104) and Wis 11–19, arguing that the former text may be regarded as the substructure of the latter. In the ensuing subsections, however, we shall see that this substructural role is only possible if Ps 105(104) is abstracted from its canonical context.

Overview of Psalm 105(104): Structure and Hermeneutics

Likely post-exilic in origination,⁷² Ps 105(104) is a “Psalm of history in the form of a hymn.”⁷³ The composition presupposes a cultic setting, one calling for celebratory remembrance of the LORD’s fidelity to the Land-covenant in the service of obedience.⁷⁴ Structurally, Ps 105(104) may be understood as follows:

- I. Introductory Call to Praise (vv. 1–6)
- II. Land Inheritance: Promised (vv. 7–11)
- III. Protection Inside the Land (vv. 12–22)
 - A. Representative Experiences of Abraham/Isaac (vv. 12–15)
 - B. Preparatory Experience of Joseph (vv. 16–22)
- IV. Protection Outside the Land (vv. 23–41)
 - A. Punishment of Egypt (vv. 23–38)
 - 1. Entry into Egypt (v. 23)
 - 2. Seven Plagues upon Egypt (vv. 24–36)
 - 3. Exodus from Egypt (vv. 37–38)
 - B. Provision for Israel in the Wilderness (vv. 39–41)
- V. Land Inheritance: Fulfilled (vv. 42–45)

Introductory Call to Praise (vv. 1–6)

The introductory call to praise (vv. 1–6), with its delayed identification of the recipients as Abraham’s seed and Jacob’s sons in the last verse, utilizes terminology that proves to be important for Ps 105(104), in and of itself, and in relation to Pss 106(105)–

⁷² A post-exilic date is suggested by: (1) the apparent reliance on a completed Pentateuch [though there is debate about this point]; (2) the description of Joseph’s sufferings in terms that recall Israel’s exilic experiences [vv. 16–22; cf. esp. Isa 42:22]; and (3) the use of the plural *χώρας*/ארצות in v. 44. See Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* (2d ed.; WBC 21; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 54–55, 58, 60; Svend Holm-Nielsen, “The Exodus Traditions in Psalm 105,” *ASTI* 11 (1978): 22–30[24–25].

⁷³ F. C. Fensham, “Neh. 9 and Pss. 105, 106, 135 and 136. Post-Exilic Historical Traditions in Poetic Form,” *JNSL* 9 (1981): 35–51[38].

⁷⁴ It is doubtful if anything more specific may be said about the setting for Ps 105(104). See the discussion in Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 54–55.

107(106) as well. For the moment, we focus on the former. Two terms are particularly important. The first, θαυμάσιος (“wonder”), appears twice in vv. 2, 5. Initially, θαυμάσιος is defined by its participation in the following concentric structure:⁷⁵

τῷ κυρίῳ (“the LORD,” v. 1a)
 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (“his name,” v. 1b)
τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (“his works,” v. 1c)
 ᾄσατε αὐτῷ (“sing to him,” v. 2a)
 ψάλατε αὐτῷ (“sing praises to him,” v. 2b)
τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ (“his wonders,” v. 2c)
 τῷ ὀνόματι ... αὐτοῦ (“his name,” v. 3a)
 τὸν κύριον (“the LORD,” v. 3b)

These structural parallels equate τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (“his works”), which are to be proclaimed among the nations (v. 1c), with πάντα τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ (“all his wonders,” v. 2c). The next occurrence of θαυμάσιος in v. 5a corroborates this identification as addressees are called to remember “his wonders,” ὃν ἐποίησεν (“which he did,” v. 5b). At this point, θαυμάσιος receives further specification in vv. 5c–d by virtue of its association with τὰ τέρατα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ κρίματα τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ (“his marvels and the judgments from his mouth”). The term τέρας (“marvel/wonder”), often paired with σημεῖον (“sign”) to denote the plagues upon Egypt (cf. e.g. Exod 7:3; 11:9; Deut 4:34; 6:22), recurs later in v. 27 along with σημεῖον to introduce the seven plagues in vv. 28–36. More immediately, however, τὰ κρίματα τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ prepares for vv. 7–11,

⁷⁵ See Pierre Auffret, *Essai sur la structure littéraire du psaume 105* (Biblische Notizen Beiträge 3; München: Institut für biblische Exegese, 1985), 16. Auffret’s attempt to extend the introduction to include v. 7 because the divine name appears in vv. 4, 7 ignores the change of subject that occurs between vv. 6 and 7. As J. Clinton McCann (“The Book of Psalms: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 4 [ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996], 1105) observes: “The ‘he’ that begins v. 7 is emphatic, and God is the subject of every verb in vv. 7–11.”

12–15, and 16–22. Not only does v. 7 take up the term κρίμα to emphasize the scope of God’s “judgments,” but also an oracle of the LORD (or a reference to one) occurs in each section (vv. 11, 15, 19).⁷⁶ As vv. 8–10 make clear, these oracular judgments are in keeping with God’s fidelity to τὸν αἰῶνα διαθήκης αὐτοῦ (“his eternal covenant,” v. 8), variously described as λόγου, οὗ ἐντείλατο εἰς χιλίας γενεάς, ὃν διέθετο τῷ Ἀβραάμ (“[his] word, which he commanded for a thousand generations, which he disposed to Abraham,” vv. 8b–9a),⁷⁷ τοῦ ὅρκου αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰσαάκ (“his oath to Isaac,” v. 9b), τῷ Ἰακώβ εἰς πρόταγμα (“[his] decree to Jacob,” v. 10a”), and once again as τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διαθήκην αἰώνιον (“[his] eternal covenant for Israel,” v. 10b). God’s remembrance of this “eternal covenant” gives rise to his “wonders,” whether his oracular judgments in vv. 7–22, the plagues in vv. 28–37, or also, one presumes, the miraculous provision in the wilderness in vv. 39–41.

Mention of God’s memory leads us to the second important term in the introductory call to praise: μνηύσκομαι (“to remember”). Verse 5 commands the addressees to μνήσθητε τῶν θαυμασίων αὐτοῦ (“remember his wonders”) precisely because, as noted, God’s wonders demonstrate his own remembrance of his covenantal word, a fact that receives extended narration throughout the body of the psalm and, as we shall see, serves as part of an *inclusio* towards its beginning and end (vv. 8, 42). Given

⁷⁶ The expression τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ of v. 5d may also look forward to the plagues in vv. 28–36 in that two of them are cast as speech-acts: εἶπεν, καὶ ἦλθεν (vv. 31, 34).

⁷⁷ Jannes Smith (“A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the Hallelouia Psalms of the Septuagint” [Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005], 62) notes the following regarding the difference between the MT and LXX for v. 9a: “The antecedent of וְאֵלֶּיךָ is not immediately obvious, but the verb כָּרַת suggests that it is בְּרִית of verse 8a.... Masculine ὃν, however, refers to λόγου of verse 8b.”

that Ps 105(104) concludes by stressing that the purpose of God's covenant fidelity is ὅπως ἂν φυλάξωσιν τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ ἐκζητήσωσιν ("so that they [Israel] would keep his righteous requirements and seek out his Law," v. 45),⁷⁸ the entire psalm may be understood as a call for reciprocal covenantal memory on the part of God's people.

Land Inheritance: Promise and Fulfillment (vv. 7–11, 42–45)

Turning to vv. 7–11, this section defines the content of God's covenant as the Land promised to the Patriarchs. Appearing for the first two of ten times in the psalm, the key term γῆ ("land") frames the section (vv. 7, 11; cf. also vv. 16, 23, 27, 30, 32, 35[2x], 36).⁷⁹ Its meaning, however, changes. In v. 7 γῆ refers to the whole earth, as the adjective πᾶς ("all") makes clear, while v. 11 restricts reference to τὴν γῆν Χανάαν ("the land of Canaan"). The implication is that because ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ ("his judgments [go] into all the earth," v. 7), the LORD God is able to give one portion of that earth to Israel as an inheritance (v. 11). Interestingly, the geographical movement of the psalm begins in the promised, though not yet possessed, Land of Canaan (vv. 12–22) and moves outside of that land to Egypt, or Ham, (vv. 23–38) as well as to the wilderness (vv. 39–41). Throughout each stage of the journey, the LORD's "wonders," including his judgments, which are global in extent, ensure Israel's protection and provision.

⁷⁸ With the verb ζητέω occurring three times in vv. 3–4, the appearance of the cognate ἐκζητέω in v. 45 suggests that "seeking the LORD" is ultimately equated with Torah-obedience. This equation is not so clear in the MT, which uses different verbs: שׁוּבָה and שׁוּבָה in vv. 3–4 and נָצַר in v. 45.

⁷⁹ Along with γῆ/אֶרֶץ, Richard J. Clifford ("Style and Purpose in Psalm 105," *Bib* 60 [1979]: 420–27) identifies δοῦλος/עַבְדִּי (vv. 6, 17, 25, 26, 42) and λόγος/דְּבַר (vv. 8, 19, 27, 28, 42) as key words recurring throughout Ps 105(104). He is followed by Anthony R. Ceresko, "A Poetic Analysis of Ps 105, with Attention to Its Use of Irony," *Bib* 64 (1983): 20–46.

By the end of the psalm (vv. 42–45), the promise of Land-inheritance has been fulfilled. In fact, following the introductory call to praise, vv. 7–11 and 42–45 serve as structural frames for the psalm:⁸⁰

Table 49. Ps 105(104):7–11, 42–45

⁸ ἐμνήσθη ... λόγου ...,	⁸ He remembered ... [his] word ...,
⁹ ὃν διέθετο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ...	⁹ which he disposed to Abraham , ...
¹¹ λέγων Σοὶ δώσω τὴν γῆν Χανάαν σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας ὑμῶν.	¹¹ saying, “To you I will give the Land of Canaan [as] your portion for inheritance .”
⁴² ὅτι ἐμνήσθη τοῦ λόγου ... τοῦ πρὸς Ἀβραάμ ...	⁴² Because he remembered the word ... to Abraham ...
⁴⁴ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς χώρας ἐθνῶν, καὶ πόνους λαῶν ἐκληρονόμησαν....	⁴⁴ and he gave them [the] countries of the nations, and [the] labors of the peoples they inherited

Thus, following the introductory call to praise (vv. 1–6), the entire psalm is cast in terms of the tension between the promise and fulfillment of the Land covenanted to the Patriarchs.

Protection Inside the Land (vv. 12–15, 16–22)

Representative Experiences (vv. 12–15). As the narrative portion of Ps 105(104) begins in vv. 12–15, the patriarchal generation is a precariously small band of παροίκους ἐν αὐτῇ (“sojourners in it,” v. 12), that is, their σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας (“portion of inheritance,” v. 11; cf. Exod 6:4). Although in the Land, they do not yet possess the Land. Instead, this group wanders from nation to nation, always at the mercy of foreign

⁸⁰ Recognition of at least some portion of these parallels is common. See Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms III: 101–150* (AB 17A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), 62; Holm-Nielsen, “Exodus,” 23; Ceresko, “Poetic,” 26, 29; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 56; W. Dennis Tucker Jr., “Revisiting the Plagues in Psalm CV,” *VT* 55 (2005): 401–11[402]. The *inclusio* between vv. 7–11 and 42–45 is a much clearer structural starting point than Ceresko’s (ibid., 25–26) claim that v. 23 is a hinge verse, preceded and followed by 22 verses, a claim that forces him to include the introductory call to praise (vv. 1–6) in what he regards as the first part of the psalm (vv. 1–22), even though it has no clear parallel in the second part of the psalm (vv. 24–45).

monarchs (v. 13). The LORD, however, does not permit anyone to harm them, rebuking βασιλεῖς (“kings”) on their account with the warning: Μὴ ἅπτεσθε τῶν χριστῶν μου καὶ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις μου μὴ πονηρεύεσθε (“Do not touch my anointed ones and to my prophets do no evil,” vv. 14–15). The earlier reference to Abraham and Isaac in v. 9, the plural “kings” in v. 14, and the similarity of the warning in v. 15 to Gen 20:6; 26:11 (verses describing crises involving the wives of Abraham and Isaac respectively),⁸¹ suggest that, in the first instance, these two patriarchs are in view. Corroboration for this identification may be found in the designations of v. 15: χριστῶν μου (“my anointed ones”) and προφήταις μου (“my prophets”). The reference to Abraham as a προφήτης (“prophet”) in Gen 20:7 probably inspired the latter. Similarly, the prediction in Gen 17:6, 16, given in the context of foretelling Isaac’s birth, that kings will come from Abraham’s loins likely led to the former.

Yet, if Abraham and Isaac are primarily in view in vv. 14–15, they are not exclusively so. The failure to name them combined with the plural designations of v. 15 and portrayal of a sojourning group earlier in vv. 12–13 suggest that, secondarily, the Israelite nation is also in view. Divine protection and titles once reserved for the elite

⁸¹ Gen 20:6: ... οὐκ ἀφῆκά σε ἅψασθαι αὐτῆς; Gen 26:11: Πᾶς ὁ ἀπτόμενος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου ἢ τῆς γυναίκος αὐτοῦ θανάτῳ ἔνοχος ἔσται. Cf. also Gen 20:4. Although the terminology of Ps 105(104):15 recalls Gen 20:6; 26:11, it is important to note that the use of that terminology differs considerably. In Gen 20:6 God does not warn Abimelech against touching Sarah; rather God validates the purity of Abimelech’s intentions in taking Sarah (whom he thought was Abraham’s sister) as a wife, and informs Abimelech that he has been divinely kept from touching Sarah. In Gen 26:11, on the other hand, it is Abimelech, not God, who warns against touching either Isaac or Rebekah. In contrast to Gen 20:6; 26:11, texts in which foreign monarchs are not perpetrators against the patriarchs but victims of their lies who nevertheless act benevolently, Ps 105(104):14 presupposes a setting in which foreign monarchs are aggressors in need of divine restraint.

have been democratized and applied to the people as a whole.⁸² In that sense, the experiences of Abraham and Isaac are not extraordinary, but representative. Moreover, the regal appellation “anointed” looks forward to the day when the sojourning of this small band *in their Land of inheritance* would end and a kingdom emerge. The manner in which vv. 12–15 are narrated, in other words, already anticipates the fulfillment of the Land covenant.

Preparatory Experiences (vv. 16–22). As a step toward that fulfillment, Israel had to leave her inheritance to sojourn in another land, that of Ham, or Egypt (cf. v. 23).⁸³ The Joseph story in vv. 16–22 prepares for Israel’s geographical transition (see esp. v. 17). This version of the story, however, is telescoped and chronologically inverted.⁸⁴ The famine (v. 16) precedes rather than, as in Gen 37, 39–41, follows Joseph’s enslavement or incarceration, liberation, and exaltation (vv. 17–22). The effect is to highlight not only the preparatory but also the proleptic role of Joseph as “that of Israel in miniature.”⁸⁵ His

⁸² Cf. Notker Füglister, “Psalm 105 und die Väterverheißung,” in *Die Väter Israels: Beiträge zur Theologie der Patriarchenüberlieferungen im Alten Testament* (ed. Manfred Görg, Augustin R. Müller, and Josef Scharbert; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989), 41–59[58]; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 58.

⁸³ Angelo Passaro (“Theological Hermeneutics and Historical Motifs in Pss 105–106,” in *History and Identity: How Israel’s Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History* [ed. Núria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen; Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2006; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006], 46) draws attention to the repetition term גל, or πάροικος and παροικέω for the LXX, in vv. 12, 23.

⁸⁴ There are also subtle differences between the MT and LXX versions of vv. 16–22 that may be significant. Ceresko (“Poetic,” 34–35) argues for an ironic contrast involving Joseph in MT Ps 105:18, 22: The prisoner whose נַפְשׁוֹ (“neck”) passed through iron subsequently teaches Egyptian rulers בְּנַפְשׁוֹ (“personally”). In LXX Ps 104:18, 22, however, נַפְשׁוֹ is translated by different terms, eliminating the proposed ironic contrast. Similarly, based, in part, on “the repetition of the initial verbs *šlh* (2x) and *šym* immediately preceding (vv. 17. 20. 21) and following (vv. 26. 27. 28),” Ceresko (ibid., 25–26) identifies v. 23 as a structurally significant hinge. Yet, the LXX provides a contextual rendering of עָיִן in v. 21 (utilizing the term καθίστημι, as opposed to τίθημι in v. 27), which obscures the MT’s verbal pattern.

⁸⁵ Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 58. See also Passaro, “Theological,” 47.

experiences of being sold into slavery (Gen 37:27–28, 36; 45:4) and humbled in jail (Gen 39:20) evoke the later experiences of exiled Israelites as well (cf. Isa 42:22; 50:1; 52:3).⁸⁶

Protection Outside the Land (vv. 23–41)

Punishment of Egypt: Seven Plagues (vv. 23–38). The protection that Israel receives outside the Land of inheritance is framed by her entry into and exodus from Egypt (vv. 23, 37–38): καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰσραὴλ (“and Israel entered”) corresponds to καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς ... ἐν τῇ ἐξόδῳ αὐτούς (“and [the LORD] led them out ... at their [the Israelites’] exodus”), while the term Αἴγυπτος (“Egypt”), appearing only in these verses in the psalm, serves as an *inclusio*. In vv. 24–30, we encounter the following chiasm of initial verbs in the Hebrew text, partially obscured in Greek translation:⁸⁷

וַיַּפֵּר, καὶ ἡῤῥῖξεν (“and he made fruitful,” “and he increased,” v. 24)

וַיִּפְּךָ, μετέστρεψεν (“he turned,” v. 25)

וַיִּשְׁלַח, ἐξάπεστευεν (“he sent,” v. 26)

וַיִּשֶׁם,⁸⁸ ἔθετο (“he placed,” v. 27)

וַיִּשְׁלַח, ἐξάπεστευεν (“he sent,” v. 28)

וַיִּפְּךָ, μετέστρεψεν (“he turned,” v. 29)

וַיַּרְצֵם, ἐξῆρπεν ἡ γῆ (“he made swarm,”⁸⁹ “the earth creeped out,” v. 30)

⁸⁶ The reference to the famine in Ps 105(104):16 may be understood similarly, both as an allusion to the days of Joseph (Gen 41:53–57) and to exile (Lev 26:26; Ezek 4:16; 5:16; 14:13).

⁸⁷ Clifford (“Style,” 425) first noted the chiasmic relationship between vv. 25–29, while Ceresko (“Poetic,” 41–42) extended it to include vv. 24 and 30 as well.

⁸⁸ Here I emend the MT from שִׁמוּ to שִׁם. As Allen (*Psalms 101–150*, 53) observes: “MT שִׁמוּ, ‘they set,’ takes Moses and Aaron as subj., while LXX and Syr. imply שִׁם, ‘he set,’ with Yahweh as subj., which suits the contextual stress on providential actions. Commentators usually adopt the latter reading....”

⁸⁹ This rendering of the Hebrew presumes, as Dahood (*Psalms III*, 60–61) notes, either “Vocalizing piel *šērēš* for MT qal *šāraš*” or giving the latter a “causative meaning.”

As this diagram illustrates, the LXX translation obscures the outer members of the chiasm (vv. 24–30). Whereas פרה (“make fruitful”) and שרץ (“swarm”) recall MT Gen 8:17; 9:7 and especially Exod 1:7, the LXX contextually renders the latter term with ἐξέρπω (“creep out”), rather than πληθύνω (“multiply”), as in LXX Gen 8:17; 9:7; Exod 1:7. The Greek terms ἀύξάνω (“increase”) and ἐξέρπω of vv. 24, 30 thus form an unsuited pair. Moreover, the subject of the verb in LXX Ps 104:30 is ἡ γῆ (“the land”), not the LORD as in v. 24, further undermining the parallel.

Even if the outer members of the chiasm are obscured in the LXX, the rest are clear. The center draws attention to the LORD’s covenantal act (cf. v. 8) of placing among, or entrusting to, Moses and Aaron τοὺς λόγους τῶν σημείων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν τεράτων (“the words of his signs and marvels,” v. 27), that is, as we have seen, the plagues upon Egypt that follow. This chiastic interlocking of events “serves to show Yahweh’s total control of Egypt’s attack and of his counter-attack.”⁹⁰

With mention of the plagues in vv. 28–36, we come to a portion of the psalm that has generated considerable debate, especially regarding the Hebrew form of the text.⁹¹ For our purposes, two issues require discussion: the interpretation of v. 28 and the number of plagues enumerated in vv. 28–36. Beginning with the former, the primary question concerning the interpretation of v. 28 is the presence or absence of the negation in relation to the subject of παρεπίκρανεν (“they became embittered [at]”), which

⁹⁰ Clifford, “Style,” 425.

⁹¹ Besides standard commentaries, see especially B. Margulis, “The Plagues Tradition in Ps 105,” *Bib* 50 (1969): 491–96; Samuel E. Loewenstamm, “The Number of Plagues in Psalm 105,” *Bib* 52 (1971): 34–38; Thijs Booij, “The Role of Darkness in Psalm CV 28,” *VT* 39 (1989): 209–14; Archie C. C. Lee, “Genesis I and the Plagues Tradition in Psalm CV,” *VT* 40 (1990): 257–63; Tucker Jr., “Revisiting,” 401–11.

translates מָרּוּ (“they rebelled”).⁹² Although the MT possesses the negation as do two important LXX manuscripts (Codex Sinaiticus, 2110), other LXX texts (e.g. B, R, 55) omit the negation. Without the negation, the implication is that the subject of παρεπίκραναν is the Egyptians whose embitterment occasions the plagues. With the negation, however, the subject shifts to Moses and Aaron, whose lack of disobedience distinguishes them from the Egyptians.⁹³

That Moses and Aaron are the subject is suggested by comparing v. 27 to v. 28. Moses and Aaron, to whom the LORD entrusted his λόγους (“words”) in the former verse, are portrayed as not rebelling against those λόγους, presumably their responsibility to carry them out, in the latter verse. Moreover, Jannes Smith makes a compelling case for retaining οὐ (“no, not”) as the original LXX reading.⁹⁴

With the interpretation of v. 28 resolved, we may now consider the second issue: the number of plagues enumerated in vv. 28–36. The following table compares the sequence and content of plagues in Exod 7:14–12:30 and Ps 105(104):28–36:

Table 50. Plagues of Exod 7:14–12:30 and Ps 105(104):28–36

	Exod 7:14–12:30	Ps 105(104):28–36
1	αἷμα (“Blood”) [7:14–25]	σκότος (“Darkness”) [v. 28]
2	βάτραχοι (“Frogs”) [8:1–15]	αἷμα (“Blood”) [v. 29]

⁹² Booij (“Role,” 209) also raises questions about how מָרּוּ is to be understood, arguing that it is employed transitively with personified darkness serving as the subject; yet he concedes that, with καὶ ἐσκότασεν, the LXX renders this verb as “an internal causative.” Thus the issue need not detain us.

⁹³ The Egyptians may still be the subject of מָרּוּ or παρεπίκραναν with the negation if the statement is construed as a question expecting an affirmative answer: “Did they [the Egyptians] not rebel against his words?” This possibility, however, is often mentioned only to be dismissed. See, for example, Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150: A Continental Commentary* (trans. Hilton C. Oswald; CC; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 308; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 53.

⁹⁴ Smith, “Linguistic,” 94–95.

3	σκνῖφες (“Gnats”) [8:16–19]	βάτραχοι (“Frogs”) [v. 30]
4	κυνάμυια (“Flies”) [8:20–32]	κυνάμυια (“Flies”) [v. 31a]
5	κτῆνος θάνατος (“Livestock Death”) [9:1–7]	σκνῖπες (“Gnats”) [v. 31b]
6	ἔλκη (“Boils”) [9:8–12]	χάλαζα (“Hail”) [vv. 32–33]
7	χάλαζα (“Hail”) [9:13–35]	ἀκρίς (“Locusts”) [vv. 34–35]
8	ἀκρίς (“Locust”) [10:1–20]	πρωτότοκος (“Firstborn”) [vv. 36–37]
9	σκότος (“Darkness”) [10:21–29]	
10	πρωτότοκος (“Firstborn”) [11:1–12:30]	

On the surface, Ps 105(104):28–37 appears to enumerate eight plagues in a different order from the ten of Exod 7:14–30. Yet, scholars disagree about how to count these plagues. The debate centers on whether v. 31 narrates two separate plagues or combines the flies and gnats into one. A comparison between vv. 31 and 34 proves instructive:

Table 51. Ps 105(104):31, 34

³¹ εἶπεν, καὶ ἦλθεν κυνόμυια καὶ σκνῖπες ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὁροις αὐτῶν.	³¹ He spoke, and flies came and gnats in all their regions.
³⁴ εἶπεν, καὶ ἦλθεν ἀκρίς καὶ βροῦχος, οὗ οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμός....	³⁴ He spoke, and locusts came and locust larvae, which were without number....

The formal similarity suggests that just as v. 34 recounts one plague, utilizing two terms that relate to locusts, so too does v. 31,⁹⁵ thereby classifying flies and gnats together within the broader category of flying “insects.” Thus, in spite of initial appearances to the contrary, Ps 105(104):28–36 enumerates seven plagues.

Moving from enumeration to interpretation, the diagram on p. 406 shows that the chiasmic structure of vv. 24–30 includes the first three plagues. Significantly, at the precise point at which this chiasmic structure concludes we find a word-fulfillment pattern in the repetition of εἶπεν, καὶ ἦλθεν (“He [God] spoke, and there came,” vv. 31, 34),

⁹⁵ So Loewenstamm, “Number,” 35.

followed by καὶ ἐπάταξεν (“and he smote,” vv. 33, 36).⁹⁶ This pattern is similar to the word-fulfillment formula of Gen 1:1–2:3,⁹⁷ initiated by the statement: Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός (“And God said”; Gen 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26).⁹⁸ Yet, whereas in Gen 1:3–2:3 God’s word-fulfillment acts bring about creation, in Ps 105(104):28–36 they bring about destruction. What these acts destroy, however, is not the created earth as a whole, but rather, as the fourteen references to αὐτῶν (“their”) in vv. 29–36 make clear: the Egyptians’ environment.⁹⁹ Viewed within the psalm as a whole, the contrast between the LORD’s preservation of one land (cf. vv. 7–11, 42–45) and destruction of another is stark.

Provision for Israel in the Wilderness (vv. 39–41). In Ps 105(104):39–41, we encounter a change of scenery to the wilderness. Here, the hermeneutical perspective of Ps 105(104) is especially apparent as episodes from Israel’s desert journey to the Promised Land are given an entirely positive spin by omitting any reference to rebellion

⁹⁶ This pattern was first noted by Clifford, “Style,” 425.

⁹⁷ So Lee (“Genesis,” 257–63), who, adopting the literary analysis of Bernhard W. Anderson (“A Stylistic Study of the Priestly Creation Story,” in *Canon and Authority: Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology* [ed. George W. Coats and Burke O. Long; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977], 148–62), goes even further by proposing that the seven plagues of MT Ps 105:28–36 do not reflect a tradition independent from that of the Pentateuch (as argued by Loewenstamm, “Number,” 34–38; Erik Haglund, *Historical Motifs in the Psalms* [ConBOT 23; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1984], 26; Booi, “Role,” 214, n. 23) but rather a reconfiguration of the plague tradition into an account antithetical to that of the seven-days of creation in Gen 1:1–2:3.

⁹⁸ The phrase καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός also occurs in Gen 1:29 but not in relation to a creative act. The other elements of the word-fulfillment formula in Gen 1:1–31 are: an indication of divine approbation, with one exception καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεός ὅτι καλόν/καλά (LXX Gen 1:4, 8, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31); and then a statement signifying the accomplishment of that command, with one exception καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως (LXX Gen 1:6, 9, 11, 15, 20, 24, 30). On both exceptions, see Anderson, “Stylistic,” 152, n. 12, n. 13.

⁹⁹ I owe this observation regarding αὐτῶν to Konrad Schaefer, *Psalms* (Berit Olam; Collegeville: Liturgical, 2001), 260. The term αὐτῶν also occurs in v. 37. In this case, however, it refers to the Israelites whose tribes, unlike the Egyptians suffering from the firstborn plague, contained no sick among them.

along the way.¹⁰⁰ Instead, these stories are remembered as examples of divine provision. Verse 39 recalls the cloud and fire (cf. Exod 13:21–22; 14:19–20, 24; Deut 1:33), v. 40 quail and manna (cf. Exod 16:1–36; Num 11:4–35), and both halves of v. 41 are devoted to water being given to Israel from a rock (cf. Exod 17:1–7; Num 20:1–13). Significantly, each episode is narrated in such a way as to create a contrast with the plague-afflicted Egyptians and their land in vv. 28–36.¹⁰¹ The cloud, rather than serving as a guide, as in Exod 13:21–22 (cf. Ps 78[77]:14), instead spreads out to cover Israel. Thus the sky that had earlier turned rain into hail for Egypt now shields Israel (vv. 32a, 39a). Similarly, whereas πῦρ (“fire”), presumably sparked by lightning, consumed the land of Egypt, πῦρ now provides illumination for Israel (vv. 32b, 39b). This illumination, in turn, contrasts with the darkness that descended upon Egypt as the first plague (v. 28). If, for the second time (cf. v. 31), the sixth plague of locusts in vv. 34–35 commences with a word-fulfillment act, εἶπεν, καὶ ἦλθεν (“He spoke, and there came”), one that leads to destruction for Egypt, then in v. 40 we find a request-fulfillment act, ἥτησαν, καὶ ἦλθεν (“they asked, and there came”), one that leads to nourishment for Israel. Indeed, this feast to the full on meat and heavenly bread stands out in comparison to the famine that Egypt must have experienced as a result of locusts having devoured the fruit of their land.

Finally, the turning of ὕδατα (“waters”) into blood for Egypt in v. 29 contrasts with splitting a rock so that ὕδατα gush forth in v. 41. While the former leads to the

¹⁰⁰ As Clifford (“Style,” 421), for example, observes: “Ps 105 ... does not mention Israel’s sin.” See also the discussion of Ps 105(104):15 in relation to Gen 20:6; 26:11 in n. 81.

¹⁰¹ Clifford (“Style,” 424, 425–26) and Ceresko (“Poetic,” 37–38) draw attention to the contrasts between Egypt and Israel.

killing of fish in what the corresponding account of the plague in Exodus repeatedly refers to as a ποταμός (“river”; cf. Exod 7:15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25), the latter leads to ποταμοί (“rivers”) flowing through arid land,¹⁰² presumably ποταμοί that would soon be populated with fish. Thus Ps 105(104), which focuses on divine protection of Israel inside and outside of the covenanted Land, includes as a prominent feature several contrasts between punishment of Egypt versus provision for Israel.

Psalms 105(104):23–41 and Wisdom of Solomon 11–19: Reconstructing the Contrasts

Now that the extensive overview of Ps 105(104) is complete, we are free to engage in comparison with Wis 11–19. The shared hermeneutical perspective between these texts is evident in two respects. First, both Ps 105(104):39–41 and Wis 11–19 recount episodes from Israel’s wilderness wanderings, but do so in a manner that either omits or mitigates the theme of Israelite sinfulness. For example, I noted above (cf. p. 392) that the author of Wisdom suppresses the motifs of rebellion and immoderate desire that characterize the biblical account of the quail in Numbers (Wis 16:1–4; 19:11–12; Num 11:4–35) and performs a similar hermeneutic of suppression in relation to the manna (Wis 16:15–29; Exod 16:1–36). Similarly, Ps 105(104):40 portrays the provision of quail and then bread from heaven as a simple matter of the Israelites asking and the LORD responding to their needs. Second, both Ps 105(104):23–41 and Wis 11–19 combine their positive presentations of the wilderness period with rehearsals of select plague traditions so as to create a contrast, whether implicit or explicit, between God’s

¹⁰² In v. 41b, the term ἄνυδρος, which translates דָּרֵי (“dry, dryness”), literally means “waterless.” There is thus a word-play present in the LXX that is absent from the MT. See Smith, “Linguistic,” 117.

provision for Israel versus his punishment of Egypt. Moreover, in both contrasts the symbolic number seven figures prominently.¹⁰³

Along with these hermeneutical affinities, it is important to note that the author of Wisdom, who appears to have drawn on numerous LXX psalms,¹⁰⁴ in at least two places reflects knowledge of Ps 105(104).¹⁰⁵ One is Wis 10:16b, which speaks of personified *wisdom* opposing fearful “kings” (plural) through “wonders and signs,” that is, plagues, just as Ps 105(104):30b refers to the chambers of their “kings” (plural) in relation to the plague of frogs. The other is Wis 10:17c. This part of the verse seems to have been inspired by Ps 105(104):39, especially the function of the cloud as a “covering” (σκεπή). Altogether, the parallels between Ps 105(104):39 and Wis 10:17c are as follows:

Table 52. Ps 105(104):39 and Wis 10:17c

Ps 105(104):39	Wis 10:17c
διεπέτασεν νεφέλην εἰς σκέπην καὶ πῦρ τοῦ φωτίσαι αὐτοῖς τὴν νύκτα.	... καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς σκέπην ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς φλόγα ἄστρων τὴν νύκτα
He [the LORD] spread a cloud for a covering and <i>fire to illuminate</i> <u>for them</u> the night and she [wisdom] became <u>to them</u> a covering during the day and a <i>starry flame</i> at night .

If Wis 10:16b, 17c do, indeed, reflect the author of Wisdom’s knowledge of Ps 105(104):30b, 39, then it proves even more important to note that four of the first five

¹⁰³ On the symbolism associated with the number seven, see Adela Yarbro Collins, “Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature,” *ANRW* II, 21, no. 1 (1984): 1221–87; M. Eugene Boring, “Seven, Seventh, Seventy,” in *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible S-Z*, vol. 5 (ed. Katharine Doob Sakenfeld; Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), 197–99.

¹⁰⁴ So Patrick W. Skehan, “Borrowings from the Psalms in the Book of Wisdom,” *CBQ* 10 (1948): 384–97[384]; reprinted in idem, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQMS 1; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971), 149–62[149].

¹⁰⁵ See Enns, *Exodus Retold*, 48, 52, 59, 135.

contrasts between punishment for the Egyptians versus provision/mercy for the Israelites in Wis 11–19 may be reconstructed from Ps 105(104):23–41. Consider the following:

- (1) Darkness for Egypt vs. Fire at Night for Israel (Wis 17:1–18:4; Ps 105[104]:28, 39b)
- (2) Water to Blood for Egypt vs. Water from Rock for Israel (Wis 11:1–14; Ps 105[104]:29, 41)
- (3) Animal Plagues for Egypt vs. Quail for Israel (Wis 11:15–16:4; Ps 105[104]:30, 31, 34–35, 40)¹⁰⁶
- (4) Fiery Hail for Egypt vs. Manna for Israel (Wis 16:15–29; Ps 105[104]:32–33, 40b)

These parallels suggest that the contrasts of Ps 105(104):23–41, even if rearranged and appropriated somewhat differently, played a constitutive role in the formation of Wis 11–19. Thus both hermeneutically and constitutively Wis 11–19 appears to have been inspired by, or at the very least is reminiscent of, Ps 105(104), especially vv. 23–41. In that sense, similar to Ps 106(105) in relation to Rom 1:18–2:11, Ps 105(104) may be regarded as the substructure of Wis 11–19. Yet, in order for Ps 105(104) to serve as the substructure for Wis 11–19 it had to be abstracted from its canonical position as the lead member of a psalmic trilogy, where it serves a very different function. We turn now to consider this psalmic trilogy before then exploring how Ps 106(105), in particular, serves as the antithesis of Wis 11–19.

Psalms 105(104)–107(106): Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration

Although Pss 105(104)–106(105) are separated from Ps 107(106) by the doxological formula that divides the Psalter into five books (cf. Pss 41[40]:13[14];

¹⁰⁶ In drawing this parallel, I assume Kolarcik's ("Book of Wisdom," 540) view regarding Wis 11:15–16:4: "The author is conflating into a single diptych the several plagues of animals and insects from Exodus (frogs, gnats, flies, pestilence in livestock, locusts)." All of these except pestilence in livestock occur in Ps 105(104):30, 31, 34–35.

72[71]:18–19; 89[88]:52[53]; 106[105]:48), the interrelationship of these three psalms is immediately suggested by their shared opening. As indicated in table 53, this shared opening proves more extensive for the latter two psalms.¹⁰⁷

Table 53. Shared Opening in Pss 105(104)–107(106)

Ps 105(104)	Ps 106(105)	Ps 107(106)
¹ Ἀλληλουϊά. Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ....	¹ Ἀλληλουϊά. Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι χρηστός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.	¹ Ἀλληλουϊά. Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι χρηστός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.
¹ <i>Hallelujah.</i> Praise the LORD....	¹ <i>Hallelujah.</i> Praise the LORD, because he is good, because his mercy is forever.	¹ <i>Hallelujah.</i> Praise the LORD, because he is good, because his mercy is forever.

In addition to this initial indication of interrelationship, there are other significant signs as well. Pierre Auffret has observed that comparison of the introduction and conclusion of Ps 106(105) to the introduction and conclusion of Ps 107(106) yields the following chiasm of key-word collocations:¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ The MT and LXX differ in their placement of the Hebrew expression הללויה, or הללוי, and its Greek equivalent ἀλληλουϊά. In the MT, הללויה, or הללוי, is found in Pss 104:35; 105:45; 106:1, 48, but not 105:1 or 107:1. In the LXX, however, ἀλληλουϊά occurs in Pss 104:1; 105:1; 106:1, but not 103:35; 104:45; 105:48. For a discussion of the discrepancy between הללויה, or הללוי, in the MT and ἀλληλουϊά in the LXX along with proposed explanations, see Jannes Smith, “The Meaning and Function of Ἀλληλουϊά in the Old Greek Psalter,” in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leiden, 2004* (ed. Melvin K. H. Peters; SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 141–51[147–48].

¹⁰⁸ Pierre Auffret, *Merveilles à nos yeux: Étude structurale de vingt psaumes dont celui de 1Ch 16,8–36* (BZAW 235; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 126–27. On the basis of Auffret’s work, Allen (*Psalms 101–150*, 79) suggests that “in its redactionally developed form” Ps 107 was “closely associated with Ps 106” prior to their respective placement at the end of Book IV and beginning of Book V of the Psalter. Significantly, Allen (*ibid.*, 4) had earlier made the same suggestion about MT Pss 105 and 106, though he does not connect the two statements. For scholars who do acknowledge the interrelationship of Pss 105(104)–107(106), see: Martin Wittenberg, “Aspekte israelitischer Geschichtsbetrachtung in den Psalmen 105 bis 107,” in *Kontinuität im Umbruch: theologische Aufsätze von Mitarbeitern an der Augstana-Hochschule in Neuendettelsau anlässlich des 25. Jahrestages ihres Bestehens am 10. Dezember*

- A** ἔλεος αὐτοῦ (“his mercy”; Ps 106[105]:1c)
οἱ φυλάσσοντες (“those who keep”; v. 3a)
- B** τοῦ ἰδεῖν (“to see”; v. 5a)
τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι ἐν τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ (“to rejoice with joy”; v. 5b)
- C** σῶσον ἡμᾶς (“save us”; v. 47a)
ἐπισυνάγαγε ἡμᾶς (“gather us”; v. 47b)
- D** τοῦ ἐξομολογήσασθαι (“to confess”; v. 47c)
αἰῶνος ... αἰῶνος (“forever ... forever”; v. 48a)
ἐρεῖ (“shall say”; v. 48b)
- D'** Ἐξομολογεῖσθε (“Confess”; Ps 107[105]:1b)¹⁰⁹
αἰῶνα (“forever”; v. 1c)
εἰπάτωσαν (“let them say”; v. 2aα)
- C'** οἱ λελυτρωμένοι ... ἐλυτρώσατο (“those/he redeemed”; v. 2aβ–b)¹¹⁰
συνήγαγεν (“he gathered together”; v. 3a)
- B'** ὄψονται (“they will see”; v. 42aα)
εὐφρανθήσονται (“they will rejoice”; v. 42aβ)
- A'** φυλάξει (“will keep”; v. 43a)
ἐλέη τοῦ κυρίου (“mercies of the LORD”; v. 43b)

The most noteworthy parallels within this chiasm occur towards the center. Even if the parallels between the outer members **A**, **B** and **B'**, **A'** are quite subtle, those between **C**, **D** and **D'**, **C'** are clear and would be apparent upon a first reading/hearing: the exilic prayer and hope of renewed praise in Ps 106(105):47–48 meets with a positive response in the proclamation of redemption and return in Ps 107(106):2–3. The shared openings and this parallel between prayer and proclamation highlight the fact that Pss

1972 (ed. Wilhelm Andersen and Helmut Angermeyer; München: Claudius, 1972), 23–50; Melvyn D. Gray, “Psalm 106,15b: Did the Children Get What They Asked For?” *SJOT* 7 (1993): 125–33[125]; McCann Jr., “Book of Psalms,” 1104.

¹⁰⁹ This part of the parallel between **D** and **D'** involves an overlap with the shared openings of Pss 106(105):1 and 107(106):1.

¹¹⁰ Cf. also οὗς ἐλυτρώσατο ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθροῦ in Ps 107(106):2b with καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθροῦ in Ps 106(105):10b.

105(104)–107(106), when read together, form a trilogy structured according to the

pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration,¹¹¹ a pattern prominent in biblical and

¹¹¹ The pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration is implicit in the use of Pss 105(104):1–15; 106(105):1, 47–48 in the Chronicler’s medley in 1 Chr 16:8–36. This medley, celebrating the installation of the ark of the covenant in Jerusalem (so e.g. Tamara C. Eskenazi, “A Literary Approach to Chronicles’ Ark Narrative in 1 Chronicles 13–16,” in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday* [ed. Astrid B. Beck, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 258–74), is composed of three psalms: Pss 105[104]:1–15 (= 1 Chr 16:8–22); 96[95]:1b–13 (= 1 Chr 16:23–33); 106[105]:1, 47–48 (= 1 Chr 16:34–36).

Although Hermann Gunkel (*Die Psalmen* [4th ed.; HKAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926], 422) regarded the Chronicler’s medley as a superficial combination of the three older psalms, recent scholarship has stressed the unity of the newly-formed psalm as well as its relevance to the literary and historical context of Chronicles. Thus, for example, Gary N. Knoppers (*1 Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2004], 650–51) observes that the plaintive plea of MT 1 Chr 16:35a, “Save us, O God of our salvation, and gather and rescue us from among the nations” (NRSV), on a literary level, is an indication that many of David’s battles are still to come (1 Chr 18:1–20:8), while, on a historical level, it reflects the author’s desire to be free from the tyranny of the Persian crown and to see the Jewish people reunited in Jerusalem (i.e. restoration). The LXX, however, perhaps out of a desire to conform this plaintive plea more particularly to the literary level, omits the reference to “gathering” (קָבַץ/ἐπισυνάγω) that occurs in MT 1 Chr 16:35a as well as MT and LXX Ps 106(105):47a, focusing only on deliverance. Yet, it nonetheless proves significant that the author of MT Chronicles chose to read Pss 105–106 together, interspersed no doubt with Ps 96, and to concentrate on the concluding plea for restoration, especially in light of his broader restoration-orientation. The author’s choice in this regard provides an ancient exemplar for the kind of Sin, Exile, Repentance, Restoration interpretation I am proposing for Pss 105(104)–107(106), even if a subtle one, and one that is obscured in LXX 1 Chr 16:8–36.

For literature on 1 Chr 16:8–36, see: J. A. Loader, “Redaction and Function of the Chronicist ‘Psalm of David’,” in *Studies in the Chronicler* (ed. W. C. van Wyk; Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suider-Afrika 19; Johannesburg: Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suider-Afrika, 1976), 69–75; Trent C. Butler, “A Forgotten Passage from a Forgotten Era (1 Chr. XVI 8–36),” *VT* 28 (1978): 142–50; Andrew E. Hill, “Patchwork Poetry or Reasoned Verse? Connective Structure in 1 Chronicles XVI,” *VT* 33 (1983): 97–101; James W. Watts, *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative* (JSOTSup 139; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), 155–68; John W. Kleinig, *The Lord’s Song: The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles* (JSOTSup 156; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 133–48; R. Mark Shipp, “‘Remember His Covenant Forever’: A Study of the Chronicler’s Use of the Psalms,” *ResQ* 35 (1993): 29–39; Samuel E. Balentine, “‘You Can’t Pray a Lie’: Truth And Fiction in the Prayers of Chronicles,” in *The Chronicler as Historian* (ed. M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 246–67[255]; Kirsten Nielsen, “Whose Song of Praise? Reflections on the Purpose of the Psalm in 1 Chronicles 16,” in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 327–36[333]; Howard N. Wallace, “What Chronicles Has to Say About Psalms,” in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture* (ed. M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie; JSOTSup 263; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999), 267–91[287–88]; Stefan Seiler, “Theologische Konzepte in der Septuaginta: Das theologische Profil von 1 Chr 16,8ff. LXX im Vergleich mit Ps 104; 95; 105 LXX,” in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (ed. Erich Zenger; Herders Biblische Studien 32; Freiburg: Herder, 2001), 197–225; Mark A. Throntveit, “Songs in a New Key: The Psalmic Structure of the Chronicler’s Hymn (1 Chr 16:8–36),” in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller* (ed. Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 153–70; Ralph W. Klein, “Psalms in Chronicles,” *CurTM* 32 (2005): 264–75.

extra-biblical writings.¹¹² The first part of this subsection considers the initial pairing of Pss 105(104)–106(105),¹¹³ particularly the manner in which these two psalms, both by virtue of structure and content, contribute the elements of Sin, Exile, and Repentance. The second part then shows how the biblical pattern begun by Pss 105(104)–106(105) finds completion in the proclamation of Restoration in Ps 107(106), especially the symbolic geography employed in the liturgy of thanksgiving from four realms in vv. 4–32.

Sin, Exile, and Repentance in Psalms 105(104)–106(105)

Even if their shared opening is not as extensive, an early verse of Ps 106(105) recalls the end of 105(104):

Table 54. Ps 105(104):45 and Ps 106(105):3

Ps 105(104):45	Ps 106(105):3
⁴⁵ ... ὅπως ἂν φυλάξωσιν τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ ἐκζητήσωσιν.	³ μακάριοι οἱ φυλάσσοντες κρίσιν καὶ ποιοῦντες δικαιοσύνην ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ.
⁴⁵ ... so that they would keep his <i>righteous requirements</i> and seek out his Law.	³ Blessed are those who keep judgment and do <i>righteousness</i> in every season.

¹¹² Cf. e.g. Lev 26; Deut 28, 30; Dan 9:4–19; 2 Macc 1:24–29; Tob 13:1–17; 14:3–7; Bar 1:15–3:8; *Jub.* 1.7–17; *Sib. Or.* 3.265–294; CD 1.1–1.1a; Philo, *Praem.* 79–172.

¹¹³ On the pairing of Pss 105(104)–106(105), see: Walther Zimmerli, “Zwillingspsalmen,” in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler* (ed. Josef Schreiner; FB 2; Würzburg: Echter, 1972), 105–13[109–11]; James Luther Mays, *Psalms (Int.)* (Louisville: John Knox, 1994), 337, 340; McCann Jr., “Book of Psalms”[1103–04, 1109–10]; Susan Gillingham, “The Exodus Tradition and Israelite Psalmody,” *SJT* 52 (1999): 19–46[39–42]; Schaefer, *Psalms*, 261; Passaro, “Theological,” 43–54; Judith Gärtner, “The Torah in Psalm 106: Interpretations of JHWH’s Saving Act at the Red Sea,” in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms* (ed. Erich Zenger; BETL 238; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 479–88[485–88]; Lindsay Wilson, “On Psalms 103–106 as a Closure to Book IV of the Psalter,” in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms* (ed. Erich Zenger; BETL 238; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 755–66[762, 764–65].

Yet, vv. 4–6 of the introduction to Ps 106(105) reveal that Israel has neither sought out the Law nor acted righteously, thereby subverting the purpose for which the Land-inheritance was given (cf. Ps 105[104]:44–45) and explaining Israel’s exilic state, a state which, only hinted at initially, becomes clear in the concluding prayer in v. 47.

Beyond introductions and conclusions, the relationship of Pss 105(104)–106(105) extends to their structure as well. In fact, focusing upon the body of each psalm allows one to discern the following chiasm:

- A Protection Inside the *Unpossessed* Land (Ps 105[104]:12–22)
- B Protection Outside the Land: *Seven* Plagues on Egypt (Ps 105[104]:23–38)
- C Provision for Israel (Ps 105[104]:39–41)
- B’ Rebellion Outside the Land: *Seven* Sins of Israel (Ps 106[105]:7–33)
- A’ Rebellion Inside the *Possessed* Land (Ps 106[105]:34–46)

Utilizing geographical scene changes and the symbolic number seven, this chiasm highlights the disparity in these psalms between divine fidelity and Israelite infidelity in relation to the Land. The center, provision for Israel in Ps 105(104):39–41, serves as the hermeneutical pivot. As we saw above (cf. p. 410), within Ps 105(104) this section contrasts with the seven plagues in vv. 23–38. Yet, comparing this same section to the seven sins of Ps 106(105):7–33 produces at least two contrasts in the opposite direction;¹¹⁴ that is, instead of the punishment of Egypt serving as the backdrop, we now have the LORD’s provision for Israel *versus* Israel’s rebellion in spite of that provision.

The first contrast concerns manna and quail (Pss 105[104]:40; 106[105]:13–15).

Although both psalms conflate these episodes and conclude by emphasizing the resultant

¹¹⁴ Although less significant, one might also point to a third contrast between the $\pi\upsilon\rho$ that illuminates the night for Israel in Ps 105(104):39b and the $\pi\upsilon\rho$ that consumes the 250 accomplices of Korah’s rebellion in Ps 106(105):18.

fullness Israel experienced, only Ps 106(105) characterizes the combined event as an outbreak of illicit desire that tested God and manifested Israel's forgetfulness. The second contrast concerns water from a rock. Ps 105(104):41 focuses on the abundance of water, even rivers, that flowed forth for Israel and could thus be tied to either account in the Pentateuch, Exod 17:1–7 or Num 20:1–13. Ps 106(105):32–33, however, recalls the latter, an incident in which Israel enraged Moses yet again (cf. Ps 106[105]:16), this time embittering his spirit and ultimately causing him, like the Exodus generation, to suffer death outside of the Land.

Reinforcing these structural contrasts are thematic ones rooted in the following four interrelated terms:

- (1) παραπικραίνω [“embitter”]: Pss 105(104):28; 106(105):7, 33, 43; 107(106):11
- (2) θαυμάσιος [“wonder”], including its cognate θαυμαστός [“wonderful”]: Pss 105(104):2, 5; 106(105):7, 22; 107(106):8, 15, 21, 24, 31
- (3) μνησκόμαι [“remember”], along with its opposite ἐπιλανθάνομαι [“to forget”]: Pss 105(104):5, 8, 42; 106(105):4, 7, 13, 21, 45
- (4) γῆ [“land”]: Pss 105(104):7, 11, 16, 23, 27, 30, 32, 35 [2x], 36; 106(105):17 [2x], 18, 22, 23, 24, 38, 48; 107(106):34, 35

As we saw in the discussion of Ps 105(104),¹¹⁵ the LORD's wonders are associated with his works, his marvels and the judgments from his mouth, as well as, by extension, his signs. It is these wondrous works, judgments, and marvels/signs that the recipients of Ps 105(104) are called to recount and remember, especially the sign-words, or plagues, of vv. 26–36 upon Egypt, in relation to which Moses and Aaron did not become embittered (v. 28). Recalling such wonders, executed in accordance with the LORD's remembrance

¹¹⁵ Cf. p. 400.

of the Land-covenant, is supposed to spur Israel's reciprocal response of obedience (cf. vv. 5, 7–11, 42–45).

In Ps 106(105), however, Israel must once again hope in the LORD's covenantal memory because her disobedience led to Exile from the Land (cf. vv. 4–6, 44, 47). This disobedience is attributed to Israel's original failure to understand the wonders, or plagues, performed on her behalf in the land of Egypt, as a consequence of which she was unable to remember the LORD's mercy and became embittered at the Red Sea (cf. v. 7). Forgetfulness of the LORD's works and wonders, those in Egypt and the Red Sea, manifested itself repeatedly during Israel's wilderness sojourn until the scourge of embitterment finally passed even to Moses (cf. vv. 13, 21–22, 33). In spite of all this rebellion, including despising the desirable Land (v. 24), Israel received her covenanted inheritance. Yet, once inside Canaan, the Israelites imitated the Canaanites to the point that the Land was murderously defiled and the LORD abhorred his "inheritance," the people as well as the *Gentile* land in which they lived (cf. vv. 38d, 40). Handing-over Israel to be oppressed by, and thus kept distinct from, the Canaanites (vv. 40–42) did not prove effective. Although Israel's prayers in response to such oppression caused the LORD, in accordance with his covenantal memory and mercy, to deliver Israel, that deliverance only provided the opportunity for further embitterment. The result was the degenerative cycle of rescue and rebellion that ultimately led to the loss of the Land as well as the longing to return to it (cf. vv. 43–47).

Restoration in Psalm 107(106)

Following a first verse that recalls the beginning of the preceding two psalms (cf. p. 415), the longing to return to the Land expressed in Ps 106(105):47a–b receives a positive response in Ps 107(106):2–3:

Table 55. Ps 106(105):47a–b and Ps 107(106):2–3

Ps 106(105):47a–b	Ps 107(106):2–3
^{47a–b} σῶσον ἡμᾶς, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπισυνάγαγε ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν....	² εἰπάτωσαν οἱ λελυτρωμένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου , οὓς ἐλυτρώσατο ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθροῦ. ³ ἐκ τῶν χωρῶν συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ βορρᾶ καὶ θαλάσσης.
^{47a–b} Save us, LORD our God, and gather us from the nations....	² Let those redeemed by the LORD say, whom he redeemed from the hand of the enemy. ³ From the countries he gathered them, from the East and West and North and Sea.

Thus, completing the pattern of Sin, Exile, and Repentance begun by Pss 105(104)–106(105), Ps 107(106):2–3 proclaims the reality of Restoration. In fact, the manner in which the four realms of v. 3 relate to the thanksgiving liturgy of vv. 4–32, the most important part of the psalm for our purposes, highlights Restoration all the more.¹¹⁶

The entry point into the relationship with vv. 4–32 is the surprising end to v. 3. Given that, in terms of cardinal directions, ἡ θάλασσα (“the sea”) in biblical parlance

¹¹⁶ There has been considerable scholarly debate about the pre-history of MT Ps 107. At one end of the extreme, Walter Beyerlin (*Werden und Wesen des 107. Psalms* [BZAW 153; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979], 83) proposes four stages, with some uncertainty about the sequence of the last two: (1) vv. 1, 4–22; (2) vv. 23–32; (3) vv. 33–34; and (4) vv. 2–3. At the other end of the extreme, John Jarick (“The Four Corners of Psalm 107,” *CBQ* 59 [1997]: 270–87) argues that vv. 2–3, far from being a final or penultimate addition, are instead integral to the original psalm, conceived as a single whole. Most scholars side with Beyerlin, although they posit fewer stages. See, for example, Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 325–26; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 84–87. Jarick’s position, however, is not without support. Dahood (*Psalms III*, 89), for instance, argues that “the entire psalm is a unity composed by one psalmist.” See also Erhard S. Gerstenberger, review of Walter Beyerlin, *Werden und Wesen des 107. Psalms*, *JBL* 100 (1981): 637–38.

represents the West,¹¹⁷ since the sea lies to the west of Canaan, John Jarick rightly notes:

“The reader of Psalm 107 must surely pause at the end of v 3 and wonder why on earth the west is apparently cited twice, when the anticipated final direction in this foursome would normally be the south.”¹¹⁸ Providing an intriguing answer to his own question, Jarick proposes that “the four corners of the world listed in v 3 can be taken as a pattern of symbolic geography applied in the four stanzas that follow”:¹¹⁹

1. East: From Desert Starvation to an Inhabited City (vv. 4–9)
2. West: From Dark Imprisonment to Freedom (vv. 10–16)
3. North: From Diseased Lawlessness to Healing Praise (vv. 17–22)
4. Sea: From Stormy Sailing to a Desired Harbor (vv. 23–32)

Besides an alteration of the realms from which people are restored, these four stanzas are demarcated by a double refrain, one that makes its first appearance in vv. 6, 8:

Table 56. Double-Refrain of Ps 107(106)

⁶ καὶ ἐκέκραξαν πρὸς κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι αὐτούς, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀναγκῶν αὐτῶν <i>ἐρρύσατο</i> αὐτούς....	⁶ And they cried out to the LORD in their affliction, and from their distress <i>he rescued</i> them....
⁸ ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων....	⁸ Let them confess to the LORD his mercies and his wonders among the children of humanity....

¹¹⁷ Cf. Gen 13:14; 28:14; Num 35:5; Deut 3:27; 1 Kgs 7:13; 1 Chr 9:24.

¹¹⁸ “Four Corners,” 271.

¹¹⁹ “Four Corners,” 274. Against the proposal of *BHS* that יָרֵךְ (“right” or “south”) should be read instead of יָם (“sea”) in MT Ps 107:3, Jarick (*ibid.*, 271–73) observes that “no Hebrew manuscript has such a reading” and that “the manuscripts of the ancient versions, LXX, Peshitta, and Vg, all have ‘sea,’” with the exception of one Peshitta text that has been corrected from *yammā* (“sea”) to *taymnā* (“south”). Our concern, of course, is with LXX Ps 106. Even if יָם/θάλασσα refers to the Re(e)d Sea and thus does, indeed, represent the south in terms of cardinal directions, Jarick’s emphasis on symbolic geography in Ps 107(106) is still valid.

The verb *ἐπρύσατο* (“he rescued”) is in bold italics because in subsequent appearances of the double-refrain (vv. 13, 15, 19, 21, 28, 31) this is the only term that varies, being replaced by ἔσωσεν (“he saved”) in vv. 13, 19 and ἐξήγαγεν (“he brought out”) in v. 28. Interestingly, ἐξήγαγεν occurs in between the members of the double-refrain of the second stanza (v. 14) and ἐπρύσατο in between the members of the double-refrain of the third stanza (v. 20), forging lexical bonds related to salvation.

This overlap in salvific terminology is one of a number of stylistic devices that create links between these four stanzas. Stanzas one and two (vv. 4–9, 10–16) provide the *reason for praise* following the second member of the double-refrain (vv. 9, 16).¹²⁰ Stanzas two and three (vv. 10–16, 17–22), as noted, both employ ἔσωσεν in the first member of the double-refrain (vv. 13, 19) and, perhaps relatedly, are the only two stanzas in which the wrongdoing of those restored is explicit (vv. 11, 17).¹²¹ Stanzas three and four (vv. 17–22, 23–32) reiterate the *command to praise* following the second member of the double-refrain (vv. 22, 32). Finally, stanzas one and four (vv. 4–9, 23–32) both involve travel that results in the LORD “leading” (ὁδηγέω in vv. 7a, 30b) those rescued to a proper destination, whether a city of habitation or a desirable port.¹²²

With these structural and stylistic observations in mind, we turn to the content and symbolic geography of vv. 4–32. Stanza one (vv. 4–9), evocative of Israel’s experience,

¹²⁰ So Jarick, “Four Corners,” 274.

¹²¹ Note that the terms ταπεινῶω (vv. 12, 17) and θάνατος (vv. 10, 14, 18) appear only in stanzas two and three. Jarick (“Four Corners,” 284–85) argues unconvincingly that stanzas one and four also imply culpability.

¹²² Although developed further, I owe this initial insight to Jorge Mejía, “Some Observations on Psalm 107,” *BTB* 5 (1975): 56–66[57].

depicts those who find themselves wandering in a waterless desert. Unable to find the way to a city of habitation, hungry and thirsty, their lives are ebbing away. So they cry out to the LORD and he guides them upon the right way into a city of habitation. They then praise the LORD because those who had hungered are now filled with good things. The association of this realm with the first cardinal point mentioned in v. 3 comes from the recognition that the sun rises in the East. Indeed, “If the realm of the sun’s ascendancy is a hot, parched land, the great eastern desert, it is exactly the kind of place one can imagine the circumstances pictured” here.¹²³

Following the circuit of the sun to its setting in the West, and with that setting the loss of light, stanza two (vv. 10–16) appropriately portrays those who are shackled ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου (“in darkness and the shadow of death”) because of their own embitterment against the oracles of God. Having been humbled and finding no one to help, they cry out to the LORD, who brings them out ἐκ σκότους καὶ σκιᾶς θανάτου (“from darkness and the shadow of death”). They then praise the LORD because he crushed the bronze gates and iron bars that held them.

Stanza three (vv. 17–22) depicts those who are helped from their own way of lawlessness. Apparently this lawlessness resulted in illness, causing them to despise food and draw near to the gates of death, until they cried out to the LORD, who sent his word and healed them. The proper response to this deliverance from decay is the sacrifice of praise. The association of this stanza with the corresponding cardinal point mentioned in v. 3, although initially less transparent than the preceding two, nevertheless emerges once

¹²³ Jarick, “Four Corners,” 276.

one recalls that the North “is frequently pictured by the prophets as the source of great evil and destruction” (e.g. Jer 1:13–14; 50[27]:41–42; Ezek 9:1–2; 38:6, 15; 39:2), so much so that “Jeremiah pictures the forces of destruction as coming from the north even when he speaks of the Egyptians coming from the south to destroy the Philistines” (Jer 47[29]:2–4).¹²⁴ Moreover, the statement in 2 Sam 24:15 that the LORD, as punishment for David’s census, gave θάνατον (“death”) to Israel that resulted in 70,000 people perishing *from Dan to Beersheba* may be “evidence of a conception that in the land of Israel epidemic disease is likely to stem from the north and spread rapidly south.”¹²⁵ If so, then this conception explains the focus on illness in stanza three.

The association of the fourth stanza (vv. 23–32) with the realm of the Sea is the most transparent of all. This stanza, however, is unlike the others in at least two respects.¹²⁶ First, we meet the participants, merchant sailors, prior to their crisis, a tottering voyage in the stormy sea. Second, the LORD, responding to their cry, not only rebuked the wind behind the waves but also, through an earlier word-fulfillment act, had caused that wind in the first place (cf. vv. 25, 29). Presumably, this was done to enable the sailors to see τὰ ἔργα κυρίου καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βυθῷ (“the works of the LORD and his wonders in the deep”; v. 24), especially since such wonders are praised among the sons of men in the last part of the double-refrain (cf. vv. 8b, 15b, 21b, 31b).

¹²⁴ Jarick, “Four Corners,” 277–78.

¹²⁵ Jarick, “Four Corners,” 278. Technically, Jarick’s quote applies to the angel of death’s movements in 1 Chr 21:14–17, the parallel passage to 2 Sam 24:15–17. I, however, find the description “from Dan to Beersheba” in the latter text to be a better a geographical indicator than the presumed movement of the angel.

¹²⁶ A third respect could be mentioned. Out of the four stanzas, only v. 30a depicts the reaction of those delivered.

Finally, the LORD's ability to stir up the sea, to the point that those sailing upon it ascended to heaven and descended to the abyss (v. 26), and then subsequently calm that same sea, through a mere command (v. 29), provides a suitable transition to the reversals of creation that follow.¹²⁷

Rather than discussing these reversals of creation and the rest of Ps 107(106), for our purposes it will be best to conclude with two more observations about the manner in which Ps 107(106):4–32 relates to Ps 106(105) and thus further underscores the reality of Restoration. First, Ps 107(106):4–32, with its double-refrain celebrating restoration from four realms, seems to illustrate and even bring to a positive conclusion the cycle of rescue and rebellion summarized in Ps 106(105):43–46.¹²⁸ Indeed, the following table shows the degree to which the vocabulary of the latter text reappears in the former:¹²⁹

Table 57. Pss 106(105):43–45 and 107(106):6, 8, 11, 17

Ps 106(105):43–45	Ps 107(106):6, 8, 11, 17
⁴³ πλεονάκις ἐρρύσατο αὐτούς, αὐτοὶ δὲ παρεπύκρναν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐταπεινώθησαν ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίαις αὐτῶν. ⁴⁴ καὶ εἶδεν ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι αὐτοὺς ...	⁶ καὶ ἐκέκραξαν πρὸς κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαι αὐτούς, καὶ ... ἐρρύσατο αὐτούς.... ⁸ ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ ... ¹¹ ὅτι παρεπύκρναν ...

¹²⁷ Ps 107(106):33–43 consists of four symbolic reversals (vv. 33–34, 35–38, 39–40, 41) and a concluding appeal for wisdom and understanding (vv. 42–43). See Auffret (*Merveilles*, 114–18) whose observations on MT version of the psalm are applicable to its LXX counterpart. The only difference worthy of note is that the chiasmic word-frame in vv. 33a, 38b, 39a, 41b (עָשׂוּ, מַעֲשֵׂה, וַיַּעֲשֶׂה, עָשׂוּ) is slightly obscured (ἔθετο, οὐκ ἐσμίκρυνεν, καὶ ὀλιγώθησαν, καὶ ἔθετο).

¹²⁸ Cf. McCann Jr., “Book of Psalms,” 1116–17; Schaefer, *Psalms*, 267.

¹²⁹ Certainly the term βουλή is employed differently in the two texts, referring to the Israelites' βουλή in Ps 106(105):43 but the LORD's βουλή in Ps 107(106):11. Moreover, the expression αὐτοὶ δὲ παρεπύκρναν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν in the former verse could be construed as “but they embittered him with their counsel,” which would mean that the nature of embitterment differs as well (cf. *NETS* trans.). Nonetheless, these parallels convey an overall impression of continuity.

⁴⁵ καὶ ἐμνήσθη τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ καὶ μετεμελήθη κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ....	καὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ ὑψίστου παρώξυναν.... ¹⁷ ἀντελάβετο αὐτῶν ἐξ ὁδοῦ ἀνομίας αὐτῶν, διὰ γὰρ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν ἐταπεινώθησαν....
⁴³ Many times he rescued them , but they became embittered at him in their counsel and they were humbled by their lawlessness. ⁴⁴ And he looked upon their affliction ... ⁴⁵ and he remembered his covenant and relented according to his great mercy....	⁶ And they cried out to the LORD in their affliction , and ... he rescued them.... ⁸ Let them confess to the LORD his mercies ... ¹¹ because they became embittered ... and provoked the counsel of the most high.... ¹⁷ He helped them from the way of their lawlessness , for on account of their lawlessness they were humbled....

Second, the setting and vocabulary of certain episodes in Ps 106(105) recur in the first and final realms of restoration in Ps 107(106). Implicit trials of hunger and thirst in Ps 106(105):13–15, 32–33, the former of which takes place ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ... ἐν ἀνύδρῳ (“in the desert ... in a waterless region”; v. 14), become explicit in Ps 107(106):4–9, also set ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν ἀνύδρῳ (“in the desert, in a waterless region”; v. 4a). These trials, like the cycle of rescue and rebellion, are brought to a positive conclusion. Similarly, the account of Israel’s salvation at the Red Sea in Ps 106(105):7–12 shares many lexical parallels with the deliverance of sailors at sea in Ps 107(106):23–32, as the following chart indicates:

Table 58. Pss 106(105):7, 9 and 107(106):23–24, 26, 30

Ps 106(105):7, 9	Ps 107(106):23–24, 26, 30
⁷ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ οὐ συνῆκαν τὰ θαυμάσιά σου , καὶ παρεπύκρναν ἀναβαίνοντες ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσει.... ⁹ καὶ ἐπετίμησεν τῇ ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσει ... καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἁβύσσοις....	²³ οἱ καταβαίνοντες εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐν πλοίοις ... ²⁴ αὐτοὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα κυρίου καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βυθῷ ... ²⁶ ἀναβαίνουν ἕως τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ καταβαίνουν ἕως τῶν ἁβύσσων ... ³⁰ ... καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτούς....
⁷ Our fathers in Egypt did not understand your wonders ,	²³ Those descending to the sea in ships ... ²⁴ they saw the works of the LORD

and they became embittered [when] ascending to the Red Sea.... ⁹ And he rebuked the Red Sea ... and he led them in the abyss	and his wonders in the deep ... ²⁶ they ascended to heaven and descended to the abyss ... ³⁰ ... and he led them
--	--

Thus the shared opening verse and positive response to the longing for return to the Land (cf. p. 422) are only the most prominent of many signs that Ps 107(106) completes the pattern of Sin, Exile, and Repentance in Pss 105(104)–106(105), adding the missing element of Restoration. Indeed, the symbolic geography of Ps 107(106):4–32, which presents a liturgy of thanksgiving for return from four realms, in language and scenery evocative of Ps 106(105) no less, emphasizes the extent and varied nature of this Restoration that has become reality.

Psalm 106(105) as the Antithesis of Wisdom of Solomon 11–19

The degree to which Pss 105(104)–107(106) form a trilogy, structured according to the pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration, has important implications for the interpretation of Wis 11–19. As should be apparent, Ps 105(104) had to be abstracted from its canonical position in order to serve as the substructure of Wis 11–19. When one then compares Wis 11–19 to the context from which Ps 105(104) was abstracted, two points are especially noteworthy. One is that Wis 11–19, with its minimalist hermeneutic in relation to Israelite sin, lacks the element of Repentance provided by Ps 106(105), the necessary prelude to Restoration, as Ps 107(106):2–3 suggests. The other is that Wis 11–19 and Ps 106(105) share five antithetical parallels:

- (1) Red Sea Crossing (Wis 19:7–9; Ps 106[105]:7–12; Exod 14:10–15:21; cf. also Wis 10:15–21)
- (2) Provision of Quail and Manna (Wis 16:2–3, 20–29; 19:11–12; Ps 106[105]:13–15; Exod 16:1–36; Num 11:4–35)

- (3) Korah's Rebellion (Wis 18:20–25; Ps 106[105]:16–18; Num 16:1–17:13);
- (4) Water from Rock (Wis 11:4; Ps 106[105]:32–33; Exod 17:1–7; Num 20:1–13)
- (5) Fornication (Wis 14:12; 15:4–6; Ps 106[105]:28–31; Num 25:1–18; cf. also Ps 106(105):39; Judg 2:10–15)¹³⁰

In each antithetical parallel, whereas Wisdom omits or mitigates the motif of Israelite rebellion, Ps 106(105) focuses upon it. Consider the fourth parallel as an example. Wis 11:4 recounts Israel's thirst, petition of personified *wisdom*, and sudden provision of water from a hard rock to heal Israel's thirst. The emphasis on thirst suggests that this is an allusion to the account of water coming from a rock in Exod 17:1–7 (διψάω in Wis 11:4; Exod 17:3), as opposed to the account in Num 20:1–13. Beyond the issue of thirst and the provision of water from a rock, however, these two accounts are strikingly divergent. Whereas in Wis 11:4 the Israelites call upon *wisdom*, in Exod 17 they “revile” (λοιδορέω) Moses and “grumble” (γογγύζω) against him for lack of water. Moses rebukes them for reviling him and “testing” (πειράζω) the LORD and even expresses fear in prayer that he will be stoned. Although the LORD provides water for Israel, Moses names that place “testing and reviling” (πειρασμός καὶ λοιδότης) because of Israel's rebellious conduct.

The incident recounted in Num 20:1–13 is more severe. Moses is banned from the Promised Land for twice striking a rock to bring forth water, rather than merely speaking to the rock as the LORD had commanded him. We saw in chapter four that Ps

¹³⁰ This parallel requires reflection on the relationship between Wis 14:12 and 15:4–6. If the idea of making idols was the beginning of fornication (Wis 14:12) and Israel has not been misled by human art, or idolatry (Wis 15:4–6), then implicitly Israel is not guilty of fornication either, since idol-making leads to it. In that case, Israelite fornication and idolatry during the Baal of Peor episode in Num 25:1–18, a text to which Ps 106(105):28–31 alludes, proves problematic for Wisdom.

106(105):32–33, especially through the reference to ὕδατος ἀντιλογίας (“Water of Strife”; cf. Num 20:13), alludes to Num 20:1–13. Moreover, this incident is identified as the point at which the people’s embitterment finally passed to Moses. Thus the ends to which Wis 11:4 and Ps 106(105):32–33 evoke pentateuchal traditions about water from a rock are starkly opposed. Similar sentiments could be expressed about each of the four other antithetical parallels.¹³¹

Intra-Jewish Debate?

My suggestion is that the numerous parallels between Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), some synonymous, others antithetical, would not have escaped the scripturally-fluent Jewish communities among whom these texts circulated in the Second Temple period. If so, their differing portrayals of identity may have given rise to an intra-Jewish debate upon which Paul had then drawn for his own purposes. On one side of the debate would have been Jews subscribing to the understanding of identity in Pss 105(104)–107(106) and the numerous other texts evincing the biblical pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration. In this understanding, it would have been important to acknowledge Jewish sin in the hope that repentance would lead to restoration, understood among some Jewish groups in the first-century as the end of Roman occupation of Palestine.¹³²

¹³¹ For a discussion of these antithetical parallels, see Lucas, “Unearthing,” 86–89. Including a discussion of these parallels in the present chapter would have involved considerable overlap with the analysis of Ps 106(105) in chapter four.

¹³² As James M. Scott (“Exile and the Self-Understanding of Diaspora Jews in the Greco-Roman Period,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* [ed. James M. Scott; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 173–218[188]) observes: “The books of *1–3 Enoch*, *Baruch*, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, the Qumran *Damascus Document*, and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* all represent exile as a permanent state of the community and recognize no restoration or return from exile.”

On the other side of the debate would have been apologetically-oriented Diaspora Jews subscribing to the understanding of identity in Wis 11–19 and texts like it. In this understanding, it would have been important to differentiate Jews from idolatrous Gentiles and especially from the theriolatrous Egyptians with whom Jews were often confused in the Roman Empire. It would also have been important not to encourage general disdain for Jews (cf. Cicero, *Flac.* 28.66–69; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4–5; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.96–106), by acknowledging the often less than ideal portrayal in Israel's own sacred writings, or particular charges, like ass-worship (cf. pp. 371ff.), by drawing attention to scriptural stories about veneration of a golden calf.

In fact, the golden calf incident provides an interesting point of comparison between these two understandings of Jewish identity. For the Hellenistic understanding, this incident would have been especially problematic, as it reinforces the very stereotypes Diaspora Jews so vehemently protested. Presumably that is why Wis 15:1–6 evokes the incident only to imply that Moses' prayer for transformation in Exod 34:9 had been answered positively; Jews, in other words, no longer suffered from the same stiff-necked nature that had led to idolatry in the past. In contrast, the Restoration-oriented perspective has no problem acknowledging incidents like the golden calf. Indeed, repenting of them is the means by which restoration is achieved. That is why the golden calf can occupy a prominent position within Ps 106(105) as the central sin of seven. In the end, such opposite approaches to the golden calf incident illustrate the irreducible tension between Hellenistic and Restoration-oriented notions of Jewish identity. Hence the occasion for a debate upon which Paul may have drawn.

Pauline Exploitation: Re-Reading Romans 1:18–2:11

Postulating the presence of such an intra-Jewish debate provides a precedent for utilizing Ps 106(105) to oppose the Hellenistic Jewish understanding of identity in Wis 11–19 and also explains how an author like Paul could employ subtle evocations of Ps 106(105) with the hope that they would be recognized. Moreover, assuming the existence of this debate allows one to account for both the broad sweep and specific form taken by Paul's argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11, including the oft-noted similarities between Rom 1:18–32 and Wis 13–15, the malleable use of Ps 106(105), and the precise manner in which Paul suddenly opposes a Jewish interlocutor in Rom 2:1–11. Presupposing, then, the existence of this intra-Jewish debate, or one close to it, Paul, it seems, tried to exploit both sides. Re-reading Rom 1:18–2:11 will allow us to see, or at least speculate about, how Paul may have attempted to do this.

In Rom 1:18–32, Paul advances what is *genuinely* an indictment of Gentile idolatry and immorality (cf. Rom 3:9) and yet his indictment also includes Jewish idolatry and immorality. That inclusion, however, is at first masked by irony. Knowing that Ps 106(105) had been utilized to oppose the understanding of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19, Paul models his indictment after Wis 13–15, while, at the same, employing key component parts of Ps 106(105):20, 41a and *appearing* to apply them *only* to *Gentile* sin. Each verse from Ps 106(105) is carefully chosen.

The initial use of language from v. 20 in Rom 1:23 is particularly important as it both establishes Paul as an ironic participant in the debate, seemingly on the Hellenistic Jewish side, and exploits the most problematic episode in Israel's history for a Hellenistic

Jew, the golden calf incident, to do so. To ensure that his ironic intentions are grasped, Paul omits reference to the calf and conflates Ps 106(105):20 with human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27, a text that, as noted, includes Gentiles within its purview. Moreover, Paul may have selected a portion of the account of the calf in Ps 106(105):19–23 that alludes to Exod 32–34 (cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6; Ps 106[105]:19–20), as opposed to Deut 9–10, because the Exodus version emphasizes transformation in a manner that is lacking in Deuteronomy. As for Ps 106(105):41a, if this verse in its original context concerns God’s punitive measure of “giving-over” idolatrous and immoral *Israel* into the hands of Gentile inhabitants of the Land so as to keep Israel distinct, Paul’s application of it in Rom 1:24, 26a, 28 seems to suggest instead the “giving-over” of *Gentiles* to themselves, that is, to deeper descent into their idolatrous and immoral ways.

Through his ironic participation in this intra-Jewish debate concerning the differing understandings of identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), Paul aims in Rom 1:18–32, especially in vv. 22–32, to delight and yet also entrap Jews sympathetic to the Hellenistic side, once again, by *appearing* to apply Ps 106(105):20, 41a *only* to *Gentile* sin. In Rom 2:1–11, however, Paul suddenly turns on these Hellenistic Jews and reveals that he had intended to include them the entire time, as intimated in the *all* (πᾶς) of Rom 1:18a and the absence of identifying references to “Gentiles” (ἔθνη/ἔθνικοί). Three aspects of Rom 2:1–11 are explicable by positing such a sudden turn. First, Paul’s repeated charges in Rom 2:1–3 against a hypocritical Jewish interlocutor of doing or practicing “the same things” and “such things” inferentially incorporates him into the

preceding sin–retribution sequence, a sequence initiated by an allusion to Israel’s inglorious change involving the calf (Rom 1:23; Ps 106[105]:20) and one that also recalls the Gentile-like sins attributed to Israel throughout Ps 106(105), especially vv. 34–40.

Second, by beginning his address of the interlocutor in Rom 2:3 with λογίζη δὲ τοῦτο ... (“But reckon this ...”), Paul mimics σοὶ λελογίσμεθα (“we are reckoned to you”) in Wis 15:2. This phrase in Wis 15:2 parallels the earlier σοὶ ἐσμεν (“we are yours”), itself an allusion to the conclusion of Moses’ prayer in Exod 34:9: ἐσόμεθα σοί (“we will be to you”; cf. p. 397). The mimicry in Rom 2:3 sets up the interlocutor for Paul’s opposition in v. 4 to the interpretation of the golden calf incident in Wis 15:1–2, specifically accusing the interlocutor of despising God’s kindness by assuming that he can rely upon being “reckoned” to God rather than repenting, even though Wisdom itself, with reference to Gentiles, acknowledges the importance of repentance if God is to overlook sin (cf. Wis 11:23; 12:10, 19).

Third, inspired by the twofold deuteronomic reference in Ps 106(105):23 to the LORD’s desire to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) Israel because of the calf (cf. Deut 9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10), Paul in Rom 2:5–11 evokes Deut 9–10 to dispute the idea presented in Wis 15:1–6 that Israel has been cured of her sinful ways. Not only are the features suggestive of transformation in Exod 32–34, which allow for the interpretation in Wis 15:1–6, absent from Deut 9–10, but this text also poses significant, if not insuperable, problems for that interpretation. As discussed in chapter four, the deuteronomic account identifies the golden calf incident as paradigmatic provocation in an Israelite history filled with provocation (cf. Deut 9:22–24). Also, by omitting Moses’ intercession prior to

his descent down the mountain and destruction of the covenant tablets (cf. Exod 32:7–14; Deut 9:12–17), the deuteronomic account even suggests, at the extreme, that in the brief moment after the tablets had been smashed and before his tripartite intercession began (Deut 9:18–20; 9:25–10:2; 10:10) all hope of reparation had been lost. Paul, in other words, utilizes the inner tensions of the calf texts in the Pentateuch to oppose the interpretation of Wis 15:1–6 for its singular reliance on Exod 32–34 and consequent inability to account for Deut 9–10.

In addition, evoking Deut 9–10 also fits with Paul's broader argumentative aims. These include the association of Jews, not just Gentiles, with impious conduct (cf. Deut 9:4, 5, 27; Rom 1:18; 4:5; 5:6; 11:26) as well as a lack of righteousness, even for those under the covenant of Law (cf. Deut 9:4–6; Rom 3:10, 20–23). In fact, it is the role of the Law that Paul turns to next, beginning in Rom 2:12.

Finally, as for Paul's position in relation to the Restoration-oriented Jews adhering to the Sin, Exile, Repentance, Restoration pattern of Pss 105(104)–107(106), it seems clear that their understanding of Jewish identity would have been closer to Paul's own than that of the Hellenistic Jews. Paul likely intended for his opposition to Restoration-oriented Judaism to emerge gradually as he proclaimed justification by faith in Christ, not by works of the Law, as the pathway to retrieve the glory that was lost in a foundational idolatrous "change" (cf. Rom 1:23; 3:23; 8:28–30). In the end, then, if Rom 1:18–2:11 does indeed reflect Paul's participation in an intra-Jewish dispute, such as the one I have sketched, then Paul attempted to play both sides for his own, ultimately gospel purposes.

Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to present a suggestive, as opposed to definitive, sketch of the larger context for my primary proposal that Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11, argumentation in which evocations of the calf figure prominently. I have not presented this sketch with the intent of making my proposal dependent on its validity or lack thereof. Rather I have offered a sketch that provides corroboration for (not confirmation of) my proposal. This sketch has three component parts. The first consists of general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians within the Roman Empire due to shared customs (circumcision and pork abstention), various ethnographic models tracing Jewish origins to Egypt, and the libel that the Jews kept the head of a golden ass in the Temple. It is in the context of such confusion, including Diaspora Jewish efforts to dispel that confusion by echoing, if not exceeding, Roman disdain for Egyptian theriolatry, that the golden calf incident, strikingly similar to Apis worship, became an especially sensitive and thus easily evoked subject.

Taking for granted the social significance of the golden calf incident in terms of Jew–Egyptian relations, the second component part of the sketch involved tracing the contours of a particular conversation concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106). I noted that the seven contrasts between God's punishment of Egypt versus his provision/mercy for Israel in Wis 11–19 seem to have been inspired by, or at least are reminiscent of, similar contrasts in Ps 105(104):23–41. In that sense, Wis 11–19, with its apologetically-oriented stance toward

the Pentateuch, may be regarded as constructed on the substructure of Ps 105(104). Yet, in order to serve in this substructural role, Ps 105(104) had to be abstracted from its canonical context as the lead member of a psalmic trilogy, structured according to the pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration. In comparison to the psalmic trilogy, Wis 11–19 lacks the element of Repentance provided by Ps 106(105) and also shares five antithetical parallels with Ps 106(105). In each antithetical parallel, whereas Wisdom omits or mitigates the motif of Israelite rebellion, Ps 106(105) focuses upon it. These similarities and differences, I proposed, would not have escaped notice in the biblically-fluent Second Temple communities among whom these texts circulated and may have given rise to an intra-Jewish debate between Hellenistic and Restoration-oriented understandings of Jewish identity. This debate would have provided a precedent for utilizing Ps 106(105) to oppose the notion of Jewish identity reflected in Wis 11–19.

With that precedent in mind, I suggested that Paul's decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, this intra-Jewish debate, or one like it. Thus for the third and final component of the sketch I briefly re-read Rom 1:18–2:11, showing how assuming the existence of such a debate allows one to explain both the broad sweep and specific form taken by Paul's argumentation. If this re-reading proves at all convincing, then it shows how careful attention to the architecture of Rom 1:18–2:11, in relation to other texts, allows a glimpse, even if a faint one, into the complex world of first-century Rome that Paul sought to address.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Summary

Primary Proposal

Since a chapter by chapter overview has already been provided (cf. “Plan” section in chapter one), it seems best to conclude now by summarizing the main line of argument in terms of the primary proposal and the manner in which that proposal gives rise to a secondary sketch. We begin with the former. Although scholars agree that some kind of bridge exists between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11, debate abounds about the nature of that bridge. I have identified four interlocking pavement stones that constitute this rhetorical bridge and need to be placed properly in order to understand Paul’s argument. These four pavement stones are: (1) A Problematic Particle. Is the *Διό* of Rom 2:1 inferential, non-inferential, or is it to be identified as part of an interpolation and consequently excised from the text? (2) An Uncertain Similarity. To what do τὰ ... αὐτά (“the same things”) and the associated τὰ τοιαῦτα (“such things”) in Rom 2:1, 2, 3 refer? Are these referents to be taken retrospectively, (referring to 1:18–32 as a whole or to 1:28–32), prospectively (referring to 2:17–24), or some combination of the two? (3) An Unidentified Interlocutor. Is the interlocutor whom Paul indicts a Jew, a Gentile, or a generic judge, whether Jew or Gentile? (4) A Possible Dialogue Partner. Is Paul engaged in a particular dialogue with Wis 11–19 (esp. chaps. 13–15), or is he merely drawing upon similar traditions?

Building upon the hermeneutical methodology of Richard B. Hays and Francis Watson, my primary proposal has been to argue that the proper alignment of these four interlocking pavement stones leads to the recognition that constitutively and rhetorically Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11, argumentation in which evocations of the golden calf figure prominently. Careful attention to the structure and subversive form of Rom 1:18–2:11 allows one to align these four pavement stones and thus discern the substructural role of Ps 106(105).

Structurally, Rom 1:18–32 (especially vv. 22–32) hinges on the triadic interplay between (μετ)ήλλαξαν (“they [ex]changed”) in vv. 23, 25, 26b and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός (“God gave them over”) in vv. 24, 26a, 28, one that creates a sin–retribution sequence with an *a–ba–ba–b* pattern (vv. 22–23, 24–25, 26–27, 28–32). In terms of form, or genre, this sin–retribution sequence in Rom 1:18–32 mirrors Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality (*Let. Aris.* 128–71; Philo, *Decal.* 52–81; *Sib. Or.* 3.8–45), especially Wis 13–15. Just as Wis 14:12, 27 enunciate two principles that link idolatry to sexual immorality and vice, in general, so too does Rom 1:18–32 chronicle the manner in which an initial idolatrous “change” (vv. 22–23) leads to dishonorable desires and their outcome, sexual immorality (vv. 24–27), as well as undiscerning minds and their outcome, improper actions of all kinds (vv. 28–32). Thus, at the very least, Wis 13–15 (pavement stone four) represents the kind of tradition Paul is engaging.

Awareness that Rom 1:18–32 mirrors Hellenistic Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality proves crucial for understanding the subversive turn that Paul's argument takes in Rom 2:1–11. Through an inferential Διό (“Therefore”) (pavement

stone one) and the charge of doing/practicing τὰ ... αὐτά (“the same things) or τα τοιαῦτα (“such things”) (pavement stone two), Rom 2:1–4 then incorporates a *Jewish* interlocutor (pavement stone three) into the preceding sin–retribution sequence, in the first instance the improper actions of 1:28–32 and ultimately the initial idolatrous “change” of 1:22–23. The interlocutor’s Jewish identity is suggested by three features of the text. First, the manner in which Rom 1:18–32 parallels Hellenistic Jewish polemic suggests that when Paul suddenly opposes a person in agreement with such sentiments, he opposes a fellow Jew (cf. esp. Wis 11:23; 15:1–2; Rom 2:4). Second, consistent with indicting a Jewish interlocutor for actions that have their origin in idolatry, the initial “change” of Rom 1:23 is articulated using language drawn from Ps 106(105):20 (καὶ ἠλλάξαν[το] τὴν δόξαν ... ἐν ὁμοιώματι [“And they changed the glory ... for the likeness”]), part of a passage concerning Israel’s idolatry with the golden calf (Ps 106[105]:19–23). Third, Rom 2:5–11 continues the indictment of this interlocutor, culminating in an elaborate double-chiasm, one in which *Jewish* priority in judgment as well as reward intrudes upon the parallelism in the second half of the chiasm.

With the four pavement stones properly aligned, through attention to structure and form, we may now review how constitutively and rhetorically Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11. Constitutively, both elements of the *a–ba–ba–b* sin–retribution sequence of Rom 1:22–32 derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. The former verse, as noted, is part of the account of the golden calf incident in Ps 106(105):19–23, one that conflates the versions found in Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10, and serves, among other things, as the central member of seven

sins committed by Israel outside of the Land in Ps 106(105):7–33. The latter verse, Ps 106(105):41a (καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς [ὁ κύριος] εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν {“And [the LORD] gave them over into the hands of the Gentiles”}), follows a key-word chiasm in vv. 34–40. This chiasm traces the bloody defilement of the Land, prohibited in Num 35:33–34, to Israel’s sacrifice of her own children to Canaanite idols, idols served as a consequence of mixing with and learning from the very Gentile inhabitants whom Israel disobediently failed to destroy, a failure that led the LORD to become enraged at his own people. The LORD’s response in Ps 106(105):41a is not only punitive but also preservative since Israel’s Gentile-like behavior, if left unchecked, would have meant the cessation of her existence as a distinct people. These two verses thus occur at key junctures within Ps 106(105) and their constitutive role in the structure of Rom 1:22–32 signifies the rhetorical importance of the psalm to Paul’s argumentation.

That rhetorical importance of Ps 106(105) to Rom 1:18–2:11 is expressed through ironic, inferential, and indirect application. In Rom 1:18–32 (esp. vv. 22–32), Paul *ironically* and yet genuinely (cf. Rom 3:9) applies the psalmic language of idolatrous “(ex)change” (cf. Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23, 25, 26b) and God’s subsequent “giving-over” (cf. Ps 106[105]:41a; Rom 1:24, 26a, 28) to Gentiles, even if the latter possesses only a punitive dimension. Facilitating this ironic application is that Paul’s initial evocation of Ps 106(105):20 (cf. Rom 1:23) omits the part of the verse concerning the calf itself and substitutes in its place human and animal imagery drawn from Gen 1:20–27, a text that includes Gentiles within its purview. In addition, Paul’s ironic intentions are suggested by the formal resemblance of Rom 1:18–32, as observed, to Hellenistic

Jewish polemic against Gentile idolatry and immorality, with particular affinities to Wis 13–15.

In Rom 2:1–4, however, through the charge of doing/practicing the same/such things, Paul *inferentially* incorporates a hypocritical Jewish interlocutor into the preceding sin–retribution sequence, the constituent components of which, once again, derive from Ps 106(105):20, 41a respectively. With the Jewish interlocutor swept up into this sequence, the application of Ps 106(105) loses its ironic overtones. Moreover, viewed in light of the portrayal of Jewish identity in Ps 106(105), the implication of Paul’s rhetorical turn, that a Jewish interlocutor is guilty of not only idolatry but also Gentile-like behavior, including sexual immorality and improper actions, has hermeneutical warrant. By virtue of allusions to the Baal of Peor episode and Israel’s “fornication” (πορνεία) inside the Land during the Judges period, Ps 106(105):28–31, 39 implicate the interlocutor in sexual immorality. Although Ps 106(105):39 does not mention same sex acts, as does Rom 1:26–27, this verse occurs in a context in which the pronounced emphasis on the “Canaanization of Israel,” through the key-word chiasm of vv. 34–40, provides implicit grounds for associating a Jew with any sexually illicit acts ascribed to Gentiles, not to mention improper acts in general.

The inferential incorporation of Rom 2:1–4 gives way to an *indirect* application. In Rom 2:5–11, Paul returns to Ps 106(105):19–23, the passage that forms the intertextual origin for the idolatrous “change” of Rom 1:23; Paul does so not directly, however, but indirectly. As noted, Ps 106(105):19–23 is an account of the golden calf incident that conflates the versions found in Exod 32–34 and Deut 9–10. Having alluded to a part of

the passage that derives from Exodus (Ps 106[105]:20; Rom 1:23; cf. Exod 32:2–3; 33:5–6), Paul now turns directly, even if evocatively, to Deuteronomy. In doing so, he has likely been influenced by the twofold reference in Ps 106(105):23a,d to the LORD’s desire to “destroy” (ἐξολεθρεύω) Israel because of the calf, a desire which derives from Deut 9–10 and is central to its cautionary comparison between Gentile and Jewish sin.

This indirect application of Ps 106(105):23a,d in Rom 2:5–11, by means of Deut 9–10, proves to be the most complex scriptural evocation to discern. The reason for this complexity is that Paul appears to draw upon an interpretive tradition rooted in the hermeneutical significance of Deut 9:27b; 10:16, 17 in relation to the *impending destruction* of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land versus Israel’s *near destruction* because of the calf.

Paul’s employment of the deuteronomic interpretive tradition begins with Rom 2:5a. He characterizes the interlocutor as possessing a “hard ... and unrepentant heart” (σκληρότητα ... καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν). Besides continuing the theme of repentance from Rom 2:4, this characterization conflates Deut 9:27b; 10:16, a conflation also found in Philo, *Spec.* 1.304–305. Deut 9:27b associates Israel not only with “hardness” (σκληρότης) but also with “impious conduct” (ἀσέβημα). Given that Deut 9:1–6 twice attributes the impending destruction of the Gentile inhabitants of the Land to “impiety” (ἀσέβεια), the attribution of impious conduct to Israel provides the hermeneutically-pivotal explanation for why Israel was nearly destroyed because of the calf (cf. Deut 9:8, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26; 10:10). Deut 10:16 then constitutes related exhortation, calling Israelites to circumcise their “hard-heart” (σκληροκαρδία). The rationale for this

exhortation is provided by a strong statement of divine impartiality in Deut 10:17, one that in light of the preceding cautionary comparison carries an implicit warning: If Israel does not overcome her own impious inclinations, she may face the same fate as the Gentile inhabitants of the Land.

Having begun with a characterization of the interlocutor that evocatively conflates Deut 9:27b; 10:16, Paul concludes this portion of his indictment in Rom 2:11 with the principle of divine impartiality, thereby recalling Deut 10:17. In chiastic parallel with Rom 2:11 is the principle of equitable judgment, or judgment according to works. In between these two principles, Paul's argumentation takes the form of a double-chiasm concerning *both* the order of reward and punishment *and* the depiction of human action and the results of that action. Breaking the symmetry of this double-chiasm are two statements stressing Jewish priority in punishment as well as reward. The inference of judgment according to works may be regarded as another means of alluding to the juxtaposition of Jewish and Gentile sin in Deut 9–10. This is suggested by Sir 16:9–14, a text that shares formal, conceptual, and intertextual similarities with Rom 2:5–11.

The final indication that Ps 106(105) constitutes the substructure of Paul's argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11 may be discerned in 2:7, 10. In the Pauline double-chiasm, these verses are parallel depictions of reward. In Rom 2:7, those who seek “glory” (δόξα), “honor” (τιμή), and “incorruptibility” (ἀφθαρσία) receive the reward of eternal life, whereas in Rom 2:10, “glory” and “honor” are not part of the goal but, along with “peace” (εἰρήνη), the reward itself for right conduct. Significantly, three of these four terms may be related to or found in Rom 1:23.

Beginning with “honor” (τιμή), although neither this term nor one of its cognates appear in Rom 1:23, the notion of dishonorable bodily treatment and desires (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι ... πάθη ἀτιμίας) is prominent in Rom 1:24, 26, perhaps implying a prior forfeiture of honor in Rom 1:23. As for the other two terms, Rom 1:23 involves changing the “glory” (δόξα) of the “incorruptible” (ἄφθαρτος) God for “corruptible” (φθαρτός) human and animal idols. Thus, in the interest of indicting a Jewish interlocutor, salvation is essentially depicted in Rom 2:7, 10 as a pursuit and recovery of what was lost in Rom 1:23, with one of the key terms utilized in this depiction, “glory,” deriving in its initial appearance from Ps 106(105). This subtle depiction of salvation, then, yields concluding corroboration for the claim that constitutively as well as rhetorically, through ironic, inferential, and indirect application, the latter by means of Deut 9–10, Ps 106(105) serves as the substructure for Paul’s argumentation throughout Rom 1:18–2:11.

Secondary Sketch

My motivation for presenting a secondary sketch in chapter six is the recognition that if this thesis regarding Ps 106(105) as the substructure to Paul’s argumentation in Rom 1:18–2:11 is valid, then there must be a broader context in which these evocations of the golden calf may be placed, one that allows for a subtle but significant use of this psalm, whether directly, even if evocatively, or indirectly, by means of Deut 9–10. Ideally, this context would explain how the golden calf incident could have been such a sensitive and malleable subject that certain words from Ps 106(105):20 could trigger an ironic and, to a Jew, innocuous application of the incident, while an inferential application of *those same words*, in the midst of sudden opposition to a Jewish

interlocutor, along with other words and associated concepts drawn from Deut 9–10 could then prove to be problematic for a Hellenistic Jewish sense of superiority in relation to Gentile idolatry and immorality. Moreover, this context would also explain why Ps 106(105), in particular, would have been chosen to play a central role.

The social significance of the golden calf incident in terms of Jew–Egyptian relations as well as the intriguing similarities and differences between Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106) provide the basis for my secondary sketch in which I suggest that Paul’s decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) reflects his participation in, and even exploitation of, an intra-Jewish debate. In presenting this sketch, I do not intend to make my primary proposal dependent on its validity or lack thereof. Rather the sketch provides corroboration for (not confirmation of) my proposal.

As presented in chapter six, the sketch has three component parts. The first consists of general confusion about the distinction between Jews and Egyptians within the Roman Empire due to the shared customs of circumcision and pork abstention,¹ various ethnographic models tracing Jewish origins to Egypt (cf. esp. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.2–3), and the libel that the Jews kept the head of a golden ass in the Temple (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.80–88). It is in the context of such confusion, including Diaspora Jewish efforts to dispel that confusion by echoing, if not exceeding, Roman disdain for Egyptian theriolatry (cf. e.g. Cicero, *Resp.* 3.9.14; Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.1; *Let. Aris.* 138, 143–44; Wis 15:18–19), that the golden calf incident, strikingly similar to Apis worship (cf. esp.

¹ Cf. Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.36, 47, 104; Diodorus Siculus 1.28.3; 1.55.5; Philo, *Spec.* 1.2; *QG* 3.47–48; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.168–71; 2.137–42; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 5 [352f], 8 [353f–354a]; *Quaest. conv.* 4.5.1–3 [669e–671c]; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.4; Juvenal, *Sat.* 14.98–99; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 3.223.

Diodorus Siculus, 1.85.1–5), became an especially sensitive subject. Indeed, Josephus entirely avoids the matter in his *Jewish Antiquities*, while Philo (*Mos.* 2.159–173, 270–274), in the context of presenting an apologetic construal, concedes that the golden calf incident is a moment in Israel’s history in which at least some among her succumbed to the lure of Egyptian vanity, specifically Apis worship.

Taking for granted the social significance of the golden calf incident in terms of Jew–Egyptian relations, the second component part of the sketch involved tracing the contours of a particular conversation concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106). I noted that the seven contrasts between God’s punishment of Egypt versus his provision/mercy for Israel in Wis 11–19 seem to have been inspired by, or at least are reminiscent of, similar contrasts in Ps 105(104):23–41. In that sense, Wis 11–19, with its apologetically-oriented stance toward the Pentateuch, may be regarded as constructed on the substructure of Ps 105(104). Yet, in order to serve in this substructural role, Ps 105(104) had to be abstracted from its canonical context as the lead member of a psalmic trilogy, structured according to the common pattern of Sin, Exile, Repentance, and Restoration.² The initial pairing of Pss 105(104)–106(105) proves especially important in this trilogy. Through structure and thematic content, including geographical scene changes and the symbolic number seven, these two psalms highlight the disparity between divine fidelity and Israelite infidelity in relation to the Land and, in so doing, contribute the elements of Sin, Exile, and Repentance. The missing member of Restoration, proclaimed in Ps 107(106):1–3 and

² Cf. e.g. Lev 26; Deut 28, 30; Dan 9:4–19; 2 Macc 1:24–29; Tob 13:1–17; 14:3–7; Bar 1:15–3:8; *Jub.* 1.7–17; *Sib. Or.* 3.265–294; CD 1.1–1.1a; Philo, *Praem.* 79–172.

stressed through the thanksgiving liturgy for return from four realms in vv. 4–32, then completes the pattern and with it the trilogy.

In comparison to the psalmic trilogy, Wis 11–19 lacks the element of Repentance provided by Ps 106(105) and also shares five antithetical parallels with Ps 106(105). In each antithetical parallel, whereas Wisdom omits or mitigates the motif of Israelite rebellion, Ps 106(105) focuses upon it. These similarities and differences, I suggested, would not have escaped notice in the biblically-fluent Second Temple communities among whom these texts circulated and may have given rise to an intra-Jewish debate between Hellenistic and Restoration-oriented understandings of Jewish identity. This debate would have provided a precedent for utilizing Ps 106(105) to oppose the notion of Jewish identity reflected in Wis 11–19, especially its account of the calf. Indeed, idolatrous incidents, not to mention those with theriolatrous connotations, were especially problematic for Hellenistic approaches to Jewish identity.

With that precedent in mind, I suggested that Paul's decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) may reflect his participation in, and even exploitation of, this intra-Jewish debate, or one like it. Thus for the third and final component of the sketch I briefly re-read Rom 1:18–2:11, showing how assuming the existence of such a debate allows one to explain both the broad sweep and specific form taken by Paul's argumentation. Especially important in this re-reading was the manner in which the language of Rom 2:3–4 seems to reflect Paul's awareness of and opposition to the interpretation of the calf in Wis 15:1–2. I even suggested that Paul's multifaceted evocation of Deut 9–10 in Rom 2:5–11 represents his attempt to utilize the inner tensions

of the calf texts in the Pentateuch to undermine the interpretation of Wis 15:1–6 for its over-reliance on Exod 32–34 and consequent inability to account for Deut 9–10.

Avenues for Future Research

My primary proposal and associated secondary sketch commend various avenues for future research. Three, in particular, are worthy of note. First, if Paul's decision to construct Rom 1:18–2:11 on the substructure of Ps 106(105) does, indeed, represent his participation in, and even exploitation of, an intra-Jewish debate concerning the differing understandings of Jewish identity in Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(106)–107(106), then how does this interpretation relate to Rom 2:12–29? For example, why does the interlocutor's Jewish identity become explicit in Rom 2:17 and not earlier? Provisionally, my response is that Jewish identity becomes explicit in Rom 2:17 not because of a change to a new interlocutor but because Rom 2:12–29 concerns the topics of Law and circumcision in relation to the question of Jewish identity.³ Throughout these verses Paul compares his unrepentant Jewish interlocutor to a particular group of Gentiles.⁴ These Gentiles lack the Law by nature and are outwardly uncircumcised, but the Law is written on their hearts and thus they are inwardly circumcised. In other words, these are Gentile believers in Jesus. The interlocutor, and Jews like him, in contrast, possess the Law and are outwardly circumcised, but he, and they, transgress the Law and thus are inwardly uncircumcised.

³ Jouette M. Bassler (*Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* [SBLDS 59; Chico: Scholars, 1982], 137) notes that “the chain ἀνόμως–νόμος–περιτομή–ἄκροβυστία unites the argument of Rom 2:12–29.”

⁴ For the reading that follows, cf. e.g. N. T. Wright, “The Law in Romans 2,” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. James D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 131–50; Simon J. Gathercole, *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 197–215; idem, “A Law Unto Themselves: The Gentiles in Romans 2.14–15 Revisited,” *JSNT* 85 (2002): 27–49.

In short, Paul argues in Rom 2:12–29 that the true Jew is the one whose Law-keeping and circumcision are reflected in internal obedience, not outward possession.⁵

Such a response is, once again, only provisional. Subsequent questions could be raised about whether or not my interpretation of Rom 1:18–2:11 entails a Gentile Christian view of Rom 2:12–16. Moreover, other aspects of Rom 2:12–29 are worthy of further exploration for the support they might offer. Consider Paul’s insinuation at the end of Rom 2:22 that Jews are guilty of robbing temples (ἱεροσυλέω). Is Paul here endorsing, or at least playing upon, an Egyptian slander that had made its way to Rome? Mentioned in a context in which Josephus recounts and refutes Egyptian libels concerning the Exodus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.223–320), the manner in which Lysimachus (*apud Ag. Ap.* 1.311) employs the charge of “temple robbery” (ἱερόσυλα) to make a pun about the name “Jerusalem” (Ἱεροσόλυμα) suggests that the answer to this question may be yes.⁶ If so, then Paul’s insinuation at the end of Rom 2:22 corroborates the broader social context of Jew–Egyptian relations that I have suggested for Rom 2. The same could likely be said about the focus on circumcision in Rom 2:25–29, since, as we have seen, this was a rite that Jews shared with Egyptian priests and likely at least some Egyptian laity as well.

A second avenue for future research concerns my claim that in Rom 2:3–4 Paul shows awareness of and opposition to the interpretation of the golden calf incident in Wis 15:1–2, an interpretation that he then tries to subvert for its over-reliance on Exod 32–34

⁵ As Gathercole (*Where Is Boasting?* 207) observes, “From the perspective of 2:25–29, then, we can look back with hindsight to 2:17 and see a certain irony there. ‘You *call* yourself a Jew,’ Paul says, ‘but you are not one in reality.’”

⁶ John M. G. Barclay (*Against Apion: Translation and Commentary* [ed. Steve Mason; vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 126, 162, n. 1044) considers this possibility, though he does not explore the point.

by evoking Deut 9–10 in Rom 2:5–11. If this claim is valid, or at least plausible, then it may find further support in Rom 9. As discussed in chapter two, Eduard Grafe as well as William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam identify Rom 9:19–23 as a text that reflects Paul’s literary dependence on Wisdom (cf. Wis 11:22; 12:8–22; 15:7).⁷ In that light, it is interesting to observe that Rom 9:3 is often regarded as an allusion to Exod 32:32 and in Rom 9:15 Paul cites Exod 33:19.⁸ Does Rom 9 represent subsequent engagement on the part of Paul with Wisdom concerning the calf? If so, what precisely is the relationship to his combative approach in Rom 2:1–11? Does Rom 9 represent a more conciliatory approach? At the very least, consideration of questions like these seems warranted.

A third avenue for future research, the last one I shall mention, concerns the tension I have identified between Hellenistic and Restoration-oriented understandings of Jewish identity. Besides the numerous textual parallels between Wis 11–19 and Pss 105(104)–107(106), some synonymous, others antithetical, is there evidence elsewhere for this kind of tension? An initial answer to this question may be ascertained from reflection on the works of Josephus. In his article, “The Concept of Exile in Josephus,” Louis H. Feldman attempts to reconcile Josephus’ largely positive attitude toward the Exile (cf. esp. *Ant.* 4.115–16; Num 23:7–24) with the view of the Exile as punishment

⁷ Eduard Grafe, “Das Verhältniss der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis,” in *Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker zu Seinem Siebzigsten Geburtstage 11. December 1892* (ed. Adolf Harnack, et al.; Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1892), 264–70; William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1895), 267–69.

⁸ See especially Brian J. Abasciano, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis* (Library of New Testament Studies 301; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 45–146.

that surfaces at various other points in his corpus (e.g. *Ant.* 8.127). Feldman's solution is to point to the differing constituencies Josephus would have tried to address. He states:

On the one hand, there were those who, like [Josephus] himself, felt very much at home in the Diaspora and were indeed thriving in it.... On the other hand, Josephus ... also sought to reach a Jewish audience; and many of them might well, like the prophet Jeremiah, have viewed the exile as a punishment and one destined to end eventually with the restoration of the Jews to their homeland. When Josephus is talking to his fellow-countrymen he uses language that will appeal to them, namely exile; but his deepest sentiments, as seen in his *Life*, are to view the Diaspora positively.⁹

The presence of such a tension in Josephus suggests that scrutiny of Second Temple literary sources (e.g. *Sibylline Oracles*, books 3 and 5; Philo's *De praemiis et poenis*) as well as archaeological remains (e.g. Roman funerary inscriptions), with a view to Hellenistic and Restoration-oriented understandings of identity,¹⁰ may yield additional evidence for the kind of intra-Jewish debate I have proposed in my secondary sketch. If so, then architectural analysis of Paul's rhetorical bridge between Rom 1:18–32 and 2:1–11 will have, in the end, led to a deeper knowledge of, and perhaps appreciation for, diversity within Second Temple Judaism, the cultural milieu from which the earliest Christ-worshippers, especially those in Rome, emerged.

Postscript: Towers and Texts

Employing Jesus' parable in Luke 14:28–30, I compared towers and texts as an opening illustration for this dissertation. The construction of any substantial piece of

⁹ Louis H. Feldman, "The Concept of Exile in Josephus," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (ed. James M. Scott; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 56; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 145–72[171–72]; reprinted in idem, *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 107; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 695–721[720–21].

¹⁰ The prevalence of Greek names within a particular community of Jewish funerary inscriptions, for instance, could be taken as an indication of Hellenization, while attestation to beliefs like resurrection, in combination with traditional Jewish names, might indicate restorational influences.

writing, I noted, is analogous to a building project. One must lay the right foundation, provide the proper structural support, or substructure, as well as smooth out any rough edges for the piece of writing to stand or for the argument to succeed. Conversely, those who undertake analysis of written works must be attentive to such components of the rhetorical architecture if the argument is to be understood and assessed adequately.

These final remarks are directed to those who analyze the present work. While I have no doubt that the rhetorical tower I have constructed requires numerous refinements, including smoothing out rough edges, adding various structural supports, and removing or replacing ill-fit stones of argumentation, my hope is that this tower ultimately withstands the scrutiny of others and, in so doing, may serve, whether in whole or in part, as a building block for other academic construction projects. After all, one of the great privileges of scholarship is the opportunity to contribute to our collective knowledge of ancient texts, including the world of which they were a part and to which they spoke. This knowledge, in turn, often illuminates our own contemporary readings of those same texts and the world to which they still speak in analogous, even if not identical, ways.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Aelian. *On the Characteristics of Animals*. Translated by A. F. Scholfield. Vol. 2. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1959.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Nestle-Aland 27. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Augustine. "The Spirit and the Letter." Pages 182–250 in *Augustine: Later Works*. Edited by John Burnaby. Library of Christian Classics 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Against Apion: Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Callimachus. Translated by A. W. Mair and G. R. Mair. Vol. 2. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1977.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community*. Photographic Multi-Language ed. Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996.
- , ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
- Cicero. Translated by C. Macdonald and Clinton Walker Keyes. Vols. 10, 16. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1928, 1976.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1933–1967.
- Ehrman, Bart D., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 2003–2004.

Epictetus. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1925–1928.

Hadas, Moses. *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951.

Hanhart, Robert, ed. *Esdrae liber II. Septuaginta 8.2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Herodotus. *The Persian Wars 1–2*. Translated by A. D. Godley. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1920.

Isocrates, Translated by George Norlin and Larue Van Hook. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1928–1945.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1926–1965.

Juvenal and Persius. Translated by Susanna Morton Braund. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 2004.

Kraus, Wolfgang, and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.

Landes, Paula Fredriksen. *Augustine on Romans: Propositions from the Epistle to the Romans: Unfinished Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 23. Early Christian Literature 6. Chico: Scholars, 1982.

Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.

Petronius. Translated by Michael Heseltine and W. H. D. Rouse. Revised by E. H. Warmington. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1975.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1929–1962.

Plato. Translated by Harold North Fowler et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1914–1990.

Plutarch. *Moralia*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt et al. Vols. 5, 8. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1936, 1969.

Rahlf's, Alfred, ed. *Psalmi Cum Odis*. Septuaginta 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

- Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Sanders, James A. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- Sextus Empiricus. *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*. Translated by R. G. Bury. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1933.
- Strabo. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Vols. 7, 8. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1930, 1932.
- Swanson, Reuben J. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Romans*. Wheaton: Tyndale House, 2001.
- Tacitus. Translated by Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson. Vol. 3. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1931.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 6. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Ulrich, Eugene C., Frank Moore Cross, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Peter W. Flint, Sarianna Metso, Catherine M. Murphy, Curt Niccum, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- von Soden, Hermann Freiherr. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Berlin: Arthur Glaue, 1902.
- Wevers, John William, ed. *Deuteronomium*. Septuaginta 3.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- , ed. *Exodus*. Septuaginta 2.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- , ed. *Genesis*. Septuaginta 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Jeremiae*. Septuaginta 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- , ed. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Septuaginta 12.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- , ed. *Sapientia Salomonis*. Septuaginta 12.1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Secondary Sources

- Abasciano, Brian J. "Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley Concerning the Reader Competency of Paul's Original Audiences." *Novum Testamentum* 49 (2007): 153–83.
- . *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. Library of New Testament Studies 301. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. "Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 3–27.
- . "Romans 3:1–8: Structure and Argument." *Anglican Theological Review Supplementary Series* 11 (1990): 77–87.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account." Pages 381–402 in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 33. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.
- Allen, Leslie C. "The Old Testament in Romans I–VIII." *Vox evangelica* 3 (1964): 6–41.
- . *Psalms 101–150*. 2d ed. Word Biblical Commentary 21. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002.
- Althaus, Paul. *Der Brief an die Römer*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. "A Stylistic Study of the Priestly Creation Story." Pages 148–62 in *Canon and Authority: Essays in Old Testament Religion and Theology*. Edited by George W. Coats and Burke O. Long. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Asheri, David, Alan Lloyd, and Aldo Corcella. *A Commentary on Herodotus: Books I–IV*. Edited by Oswyn Murray and Alfonso Moreno. Translated by Barbara Graziosi, Matteo Rossetti, Carlotta Dus, and Vanessa Cazzato. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Josephus and His Works." Pages 185–232 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Auffret, Pierre. "Afin que nous rendions grâce à ton nom': Étude structurelle du Psaume 106." *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 11 (1994): 75–96.

- . *Essai sur la structure littéraire du psaume 105*. Biblische Notizen Beiträge 3. München: Institut für biblische Exegese, 1985.
- . *Merveilles à nos yeux: Étude structurelle de vingt psaumes dont celui de 1Ch 16,8–36*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 235. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Aune, David E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Balentine, Samuel E. “‘You Can’t Pray a Lie’: Truth And Fiction in the Prayers of Chronicles.” Pages 246–67 in *The Chronicler as Historian*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham, Kenneth G. Hoglund, and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 238. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Bammel, Ernst. “Das Judentum als eine Religion Ägyptens.” Pages 1–10 in *Religion im Erbe Ägyptens: Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte zu Ehren von Alexander Böhlig*. Manfred Görg. Ägypten und Altes Testament 14. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1988.
- Barclay, John M. G. “‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy’: The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism.” *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 82–106.
- . *Obedying the Truth: Paul’s Ethics in Galatians*. Vancouver: Regent College, 1988.
- . “The Politics of Contempt: Judaeans and Egyptians in Josephus’s *Against Apion*.” Pages 109–27 in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay. Library of Second Temple Studies 45. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. “An Ass in the Jerusalem Temple—The Origins and Development of the Slander.” Pages 310–26 in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Barr, James. *Biblical Faith and Natural Theology: The Gifford Lectures for 1991 Delivered in the University of Edinburgh*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Harper’s New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- . *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2d ed. Black’s New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1991.

- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Les devanciers d'Aquila*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 43–58.
- . *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 59. Chico: Scholars, 1982.
- Baumgärtel, Friedrich. "Zur Liturgie in der 'Sektenrolle' vom Toten Meer." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 65 (1953): 263–65.
- Beavis, M. A. L. "Anti-Egyptian Polemic in the Letter of Aristeas 130–165 (The High Priest's Discourse)." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 18 (1987): 145–51.
- Beckwith, Roger T. *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian: Biblical, Intertestamental and Patristic Studies*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 33. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Beetham, Christopher A. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Begg, Christopher T. "The Destruction of the Calf (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21)." Pages 208–51 in *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*. Norbert Lohfink. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 68. Leuven: Leuven University, 1985.
- Bell, Richard H. *No One Seeks for God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 1.18–3.20*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Berlin, Adele. "Psalms in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 21–36 in *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, Its Exegesis, and Its Language*. Edited by Mosheh Bar-Asher, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, Emanuel Tov, and Nili Wazana. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007.
- Berthelot, Katell. "The Use of Greek and Roman Stereotypes of the Egyptians by Hellenistic Jewish Apologists, with special reference to Josephus' *Against Apion*." Pages 185–221 in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium, Aarhus 1999*. Edited by Jürgen U. Kalms. Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 6. Münster: LIT, 2000.
- Beyerlin, Walter. "Der nervus rerum in Psalm 106." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 50–64.
- . *Werden und Wesen des 107. Psalms*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 153. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1979.

- Bickerman, Elias. "Ritualmord und Eselskult: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte antiker Publizistik." Pages 225–55 in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. Vol. 2. Edited by Elias Bickerman. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. *Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne*. Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique. Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1939.
- Booij, Thijs. "The Role of Darkness in Psalm CV 28." *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 209–14.
- Boring, M. Eugene. "Seven, Seventh, Seventy." Pages 197–99 in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible S-Z*. Volume 5. Edited by Katharine Doob Sakenfeld. Nashville: Abingdon, 2009.
- Bornkamm, Günther. *Early Christian Experience*. Translated by Paul L. Hammer. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Botha, Pieter J. J. "The Verbal Art of the Pauline Letters: Rhetoric, Performance and Presence." Pages 409–28 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 90. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. 2d ed. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1906.
- Bouwman, G. "Noch einmal Römer 1,21-32." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 411–14.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron, Peter C. Austin, and Andrey Feuerverger. "The Assessment of Manuscript Affiliation within a Probabilistic Framework: A Study of Alfred Rahlfs's Core Manuscript Groupings for the Greek Psalter." Pages 98–124 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Braund, Susanna Morton. "Juvenal (Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis)." Pages 804–5 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3d revised ed. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. New York: Oxford, 2003.
- Brooke, George J. "Psalms 105 and 106 at Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 267–92.
- . "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 5–24 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.

- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1967.
- . “Glossen im Römerbrief.” *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 72 (1947): 197–202.
- Bussmann, Claus. *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur*. 2d ed. Frankfurt: Herbert Lang, 1975.
- Butler, Trent C. “A Forgotten Passage from a Forgotten Era (1 Chr. XVI 8–36).” *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 142–50.
- Büchner, Dirk. “Εξιλάσασθαι: Appeasing God in the Septuagint Pentateuch.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129 (2010): 237–60.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. Sacra Pagina 6. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996.
- Caird, George B. “Review of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978): 538–40.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . “A Rhetorical Suggestion Concerning Romans 2.” Pages 140–67 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers*. Eugene H. Lovering Jr. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 34. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- Carroll, Robert P. “Rebellion and Dissent in Ancient Israelite Society.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 176–204.
- Ceresko, Anthony R. “Endings and Beginnings: Alphabetic Thinking and the Shaping of Psalms 106 and 150.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68 (2006): 32–46.
- . “A Poetic Analysis of Ps 105, with Attention to Its Use of Irony.” *Biblica* 64 (1983): 20–46.
- Cheon, Samuel. *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 23. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- . *The Church’s Guide for Reading Paul: The Canonical Shaping of the Pauline Corpus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Psalms 73–150*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.

———. “Style and Purpose in Psalm 105.” *Biblica* 60 (1979): 420–27.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. “Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature.” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 21.1:1221–87. Part 2, *Principat*, 21.1. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

Cordes, Ariane. “Der Septuaginta-Psalter?: Zur Geschichte des Griechischen Psalmentextes und seiner Edition.” Pages 49–60 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Herders Biblische Studien 32. Freiburg: Herder, 2001.

Court, John M., ed. *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction*. London: SPCK, 2002.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark, 1975.

Crawford, Barry S. “Review of *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68 (2006): 559–60.

Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms III: 101–150*. Anchor Bible 17A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.

Das, A. Andrew. *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Davis, Casey Wayne. *Oral Biblical Criticism: The Influence of the Principles of Orality on the Literary Structure of Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 172. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Daxer, Heinrich. *Römer 1,18–2,10 im Verhältnis zur spätjüdischen Lehrauffassung*. Naumburg a. d. S.: Lippert, 1914.

de Jonge, Marinus, and Johannes Tromp. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

deSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.

———. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary 6. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1932.

- Dodson, Joseph R. *The 'Powers' of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 2/161. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Donfried, Karl P., ed. *The Romans Debate*. Rev. ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . "Review of *Solving the Romans Debate* by A. Andrew Das." *Theological Studies* 69 (2008): 189–90.
- Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- . *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38A. Nashville: Nelson Reference & Electronic, 1988.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dupont, Jacques. "Le Problème de la Structure Littéraire de l'Épître aux Romains." *Revue biblique* 62 (1955): 365–97.
- Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried. *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1795.
- Elliott, Neil. *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 45. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Engel, Helmut. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament 16. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998.
- Eskenazi, Tamara C. "A Literary Approach to Chronicles' Ark Narrative in 1 Chronicles 13–16." Pages 258–74 in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck, Andrew H. Bartelt, Paul R. Raabe, and Chris A. Franke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Esler, Philip F. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Evans, Craig A. "Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture." Pages 47–51 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal

for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders, eds. *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Feldman, Louis H. "The Concept of Exile in Josephus." Pages 145–72 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California, 1998.

———. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 107. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

———. "Philo's Account of the Golden Calf Incident." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 56 (2005): 245–64.

Fensham, F. C. "Neh. 9 and Pss. 105, 106, 135 and 136. Post-Exilic Historical Traditions in Poetic Form." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 9 (1981): 35–51.

Feuillet, A. "Le Plan Salvifique de Dieu d'après l'Épître aux Romains: Essai sur la structure littéraire de l'Épître et sa signification théologique." *Revue biblique* 57 (1950): 336–87.

Fichtner, Johannes. *Weisheit Salomos*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 2/6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

———. "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel." Pages 19–37 in *Midrash and Literature*. Edited by Geoffrey H. Hartman and Budick Sanford. New Haven: Yale University, 1986.

Fisk, Bruce N. "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge Among the Christians of Rome." Pages 157–85 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

———. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

- Flashar, Martin. "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1912): 81–116, 161–89, 241–68.
- Flint, Peter W. "The '11QPs^a–Psalter' in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Including the Preliminary Edition of 4QPs^e." Pages 173–95 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon. Biblical Interpretation Series 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "The Book of Psalms in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Vetus Testamentum* 48 (1998): 453–72.
- . *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Focke, Friedrich. *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des jüdischen Hellenismus*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 5/22. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Fraenkel, Detlef. "Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35–40." Pages 140–86 in *Studien zur Septuaginta, Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John William Wevers. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Frid, Bo. "How Does Romans 2.1 Connect to 1.18-32?" *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 71 (2006): 109–30.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. "Quatre conjectures sur le texte du Nouveau Testament." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 3 (1923): 439–42.
- . "Der Wahre Jude und sein Lob: Röm. 2,28f." *Symbolae osloenses* 1 (1922): 39–49.
- Füglister, Notker. "Psalm 105 und die Väterverheißung." Pages 41–59 in *Die Väter Israels: Beiträge zur Theologie der Patriarchenüberlieferungen im Alten Testament*. Edited by Manfred Görg, Augustin R. Müller, and Josef Scharbert. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University, 1995.
- Gathercole, Simon J. "A Law Unto Themselves: The Gentiles in Romans 2.14–15 Revisited." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 85 (2002): 27–49.
- . *Where Is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

- Gauthier, Randall X. "Examining the 'Pluses' in the Greek Psalter: A Study of the Septuagint Translation *Qua* Communication." Pages 45–76 in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*. Edited by Johann Cook. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 127. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "God Handed Them Over: Reading Romans 1:18–32 Apocalyptically." *Australian Biblical Review* 53 (2005): 42–53.
- . *Our Mother Saint Paul*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010.
- . "Rescue Mission." *Christian Century* 127, no. 10 (18 May 2010): 36–37.
- . "The Rhetoric of Death in the Wisdom of Solomon and the Letters of Paul." Pages 127–45 in *The Listening Heart: Essays in Wisdom and the Psalms in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm.* Edited by Kenneth G. Hoglund, Elizabeth F. Huwiler, Jonathan T. Glass, and Roger W. Lee. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 58. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.
- Gärtner, Judith. "The Torah in Psalm 106: Interpretations of JHWH's Saving Act at the Red Sea." Pages 479–88 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 238. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard S. Review of Walter Beyerlin, *Werden und Wesen des 107. Psalms*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 637–38.
- Gilbert, Maurice. "La connaissance de Dieu selon le Livre de la Sagesse." Pages 191–210 in *La Notion biblique de Dieu: Le Dieu de la Bible et le Dieu des philosophes*. Edited by J. Coppens. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 41. Leuven: Leuven University, 1976.
- . *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13-15)*. Analecta biblica 53. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1973.
- . "The Literary Structure of the Book of Wisdom. A Study of Various Views." Pages 19–32 in *The Book of Wisdom in Modern Research: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2005. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Gilliard, Frank D. "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non omne verbum sonabat*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 689–94.
- Gillingham, Susan. "The Exodus Tradition and Israelite Psalmody." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 52 (1999): 19–46.

- Godet, Frédéric Louis. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Rev. ed. Edited by Talbot W. Chambers. Translated by A. Cusin. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883.
- Gooding, D. W. *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1959.
- Goodrick, A. T. S. *The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes*. Oxford Church Bible Commentary. London: Rivingtons, 1913.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text." *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Wisdom of Solomon*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Grafe, Eduard. "Das Verhältniss der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis." Pages 251–86 in *Theologische Abhandlungen Carl von Weizsäcker zu Seinem Siebzigsten Geburtstage 11. December 1892*. Edited by Adolf Harnack, Emil Schürer, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Hermann von Soden, Theodor Häring, Hermann Usener, Adolf Jülicher, Eduard Grafe, Karl Müller, and Heinrich C. F. Georg. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1892.
- Gray, Melvyn D. "Psalm 106,15b: Did the Children Get What They Asked For?" *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 7 (1993): 125–33.
- Green, William Scott. "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture." Pages 58–63 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- Greenspoon, Leonard. "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 20 (1987): 21–29.
- Gregg, J. A. F. *The Wisdom of Solomon: In the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1909.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn. *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride*. Cambridge: University of Wales, 1970.
- Grobel, Kendrick. "A Chiastic Retribution-Formula in Romans 2." Pages 255–61 in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultman zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964.

- Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Psalmen*. 4th ed. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- . “Pauls Argument from the Old Testament and Christology in 2 Cor 1–9.” Pages 277–303 in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Edited by R. Bieringer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 125. Leuven: Leuven University, 1996.
- Haglund, Erik. *Historical Motifs in the Psalms*. Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 23. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1984.
- Haran, Menahem. “11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms.” Pages 193–201 in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Marc Zvi Brettler. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 154. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1989.
- Hayes, Christine E. “Golden Calf Stories: The Relationship of Exodus 32 and Deuteronomy 9–10.” Pages 45–93 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University, 1989.
- . “On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.” Pages 70–96 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- . “Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 107–15.
- . “Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell’s Exegesis of Romans 1.” *Journal of Religious Ethics* 14 (1986): 184–215.
- . “‘Who Has Believed Our Message?’ Paul’s Reading of Isaiah.” Pages 25–49 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture*. Richard B. Hays. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

- . “‘Who Has Believed Our Message?’ Paul’s Reading of Isaiah.” Pages 205–25 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers*. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 37.1. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.
- . “Wisdom According to Paul.” Pages 111–23 in *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? Wisdom in the Bible, the Church and the Contemporary World*. Edited by Stephen C. Barton. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999.
- Hedley, P. L. “The Göttingen Investigation and Edition of the Septuagint.” *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933): 57–72.
- Heen, Erik. *Anton Fridrichsen (1888-1953): A Bibliography*. University of Oslo. Faculty of Theology Bibliography Series 5. Oslo: University of Oslo, Faculty of Theology, 1993.
- Heinisch, Paul. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 24. Münster: Aschendorff, 1912.
- Hendrix, Ralph E. “A Literary Structural Analysis of the Golden-Calf Episode in Exodus 32:1-33:6.” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 28 (1990): 211–17.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Hill, Andrew E. “Patchwork Poetry or Reasoned Verse? Connective Structure in 1 Chronicles XVI.” *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 97–101.
- Hirsch Jr., E. D. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale, 1967.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California, 1981.
- Holmes, Samuel. “The Wisdom of Solomon: Introduction.” Pages 518–34 in *Apocrypha*. Vol. 1 of *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English: With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. “The Exodus Traditions in Psalm 105.” *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 11 (1978): 22–30.
- Hooker, Morna D. “Adam in Romans 1.” *New Testament Studies* 6 (1960): 297–306.
- . “A Further Note on Romans 1.” *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966): 181–83.
- Huby, Joseph. *Épître aux Romains: Traduction et Commentaire*. New ed. Rev. P. Stanislas Lyonnet. *Verbum Salutis* 10. Paris: Beauchesne, 1957.

- Hübner, Hans. "Intertextualität – die hermeneutische Strategie des Paulus: Zu einem neuen Versuch der theologischen Rezeption des Alten Testaments in Neuen." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 116 (1991): 881–98.
- Hyldahl, Niels. "A Reminiscence of the Old Testament at Romans i. 23." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1956): 285–88.
- Ito, Akio. "Romans 2: A Deuteronomistic Reading." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 59 (1995): 21–37.
- Jarick, John. "The Four Corners of Psalm 107." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997): 270–87.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 49 (1958): 145–56.
- . "Zu Rm 1 22-32." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 45 (1954): 119–21.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei. Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Reading the New Testament. New York: Crossroad, 1997.
- Joosten, Jan. "The Impact of the Septuagint Pentateuch on the Greek Psalms." Pages 197–205 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Jüngel, Eberhard. "Das Gesetz zwischen Adam und Christus: Eine theologische Studie zu Röm 5, 12–21." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 60 (1963): 42–74.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Keck, Leander E. *Romans*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.

- Keyser, Paul-Gerhard. "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 98 (1973): 951–52.
- . "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus. Eine Analyse der Sapientia Salomonis und ein Vergleich ihrer theologischen und anthropologischen Probleme mit denen des Paulus im Römerbrief." Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1971.
- Klein, Ralph W. "Psalms in Chronicles." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 32 (2005): 264–75.
- Kleinig, John W. *The Lord's Song: The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 156. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- Klostermann, Erich. "Die adäquate Vergeltung in Rm 1, 22–31." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 32 (1933): 1–6.
- Klotz, Frieda, and Katerina Oikonomopoulou. "Introduction." Pages 1–31 in *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Edited by Freida Klotz and Katerina Oikonomopoulou. Oxford: Oxford University, 2011.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *1 Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 12A. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.
- Kolarcik, Michael. *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1–6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation*. Analecta biblica 127. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- . "The Book of Wisdom: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 435–600 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 5. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60–150: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Kühnöl, Christian Gottlieb. *Observationes ad Novum Testamentum ex libris apocryphis V. T. Lipsiae: I. T. Feindium*, 1794.
- Laato, Timo. *Paul and Judaism: An Anthropological Approach*. Translated by T. McElwain. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 115. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.

- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Larcher, C. *Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse. Etudes bibliques*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1969.
- . *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon. Etudes bibliques 5*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1985.
- Lee, Archie C. C. "Genesis I and the Plagues Tradition in Psalm CV." *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (1990): 257–63.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Harold Knight. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1961.
- Levison, John R. "Adam and Eve in Romans 1.18-25 and the Greek *Life of Adam and Eve*." *New Testament Studies* 50 (2004): 519–34.
- . *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.
- . *Texts in Transition: The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with supplements added. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer*. 2d ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919.
- . *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer*. 3d ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 8. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928.
- . *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer*. 4th ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 8. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.
- . *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe an die Römer*. 5th ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 8. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1971.
- . *An die Römer*. 1st ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906.
- Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

- Lincoln, Andrew T. "From Wrath to Justification: Tradition, Gospel, and Audience in the Theology of Romans 1:18-4:25." Pages 194–226 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering Jr. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 32. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- Linebaugh, Jonathan A. "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11." *New Testament Studies* 57 (2011): 214–37.
- Lloyd, Alan B. *Introduction*. Vol. 1 of *Herodotus Book II*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Loader, J. A. "Redaction and Function of the Chronistic 'Psalm of David'." Pages 69–75 in *Studies in the Chronicler*. Edited by W. C. van Wyk. Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suider-Afrika 19. Johannesburg: Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suider-Afrika, 1976.
- Loewenstamm, Samuel E. "The Number of Plagues in Psalm 105." *Biblica* 52 (1971): 34–38.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. *The Triumph of Abraham's God*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Thomas Nelson: Nashville, 1990.
- Lucas, Alec J. "Distinct Portraits and Parallel Development of the Knowledge of God in Romans 1:18–32 and Wisdom of Solomon 13–15." Pages 61–82 in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood*. Edited by Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . "Reorienting the Structural Paradigm and Social Significance of Romans 1:18–32." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131 (2012): 103–22.
- . "Scripture Citations as an Internal Redactional Control: 1QS 5:1–20a and Its 4Q Parallels." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 30–52.
- . "Unearthing an Intra-Jewish Interpretive Debate? Romans 1:18–2:4; Wisdom of Solomon 11–19; and Psalms 105(104)–107(106)." *Annali di Storia dell'Esegesi* 27 (2010): 69–91.
- Luz, Ulrich. "Zum Aufbau von Röm 1-8." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 25 (1969): 161–81.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. "Notes sur l'Exégèse de l'Épître aux Romains." *Biblica* 38 (1957): 35–61.

- McCann Jr., J. Clinton. "The Book of Psalms: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 639–1280 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 4. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- MacDonald, Nathan. "Recasting the Golden Calf: The Imaginative Potential of the Old Testament's Portrayal of Idolatry." Pages 22–39 in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Stephen C. Barton. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Maillot, Alphonse. *L'Épître aux Romains*. Paris: Le Centurion, 1984.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Margulis, B. "The Plagues Tradition in Ps 105." *Biblica* 50 (1969): 491–96.
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2d ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Mays, James Luther. *Psalms. Int.* Louisville: John Knox, 1994.
- Mejía, Jorge. "Some Observations on Psalm 107." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 5 (1975): 56–66.
- Merz, Annette. *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 52. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 3–24.
- Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 14th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- . *Paulus und seine Bibel*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 2/18. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929.
- . *Paulus und seine Bibel*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
- Miller, James C. "Review of *Solving the Romans Debate* by A. Andrew Das." *Interpretation* 62 (2008): 211.

- Minear, Paul S. *The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. Studies in Biblical Theology Second Series 19. London: SCM, 1971.
- Molland, Einar. "ΔΙΟ, einige syntaktische Beobachtungen." Pages 43–52 in *Serta Rudbergiana*. Edited by Hans Holst and Henning Mørland. Osloae: A. W. Brøgger, 1931.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- . "Review Article: *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* by Douglas A. Campbell." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53 (2010): 143–50.
- Moyise, Steve. "Quotations." Pages 15–28 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Nachtigal, Johann Karl Christoph. *Das Buch der Weisheit, als Gegenstück der Koheleth und als Vorbereitung zum Studium des N. T.* Vol. 2 of *Die Versammlungen der Weisen*. Halle: J. J. Gebauer, 1799.
- Nielsen, Kirsten. "Whose Song of Praise? Reflections on the Purpose of the Psalm in 1 Chronicles 16." Pages 327–36 in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. 4th unchanged ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956.
- . *Die Antike Kunstprosa: Vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. 5th unchanged ed. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1958.
- Nygren, Anders. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Carl Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1949.
- O'Connell, Robert H. "Deuteronomy IX 7-X 7, 10-11: Panelled Structure, Double Rehearsal and the Rhetoric of Covenant Rebuke." *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992): 492–509.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. New York: Macmillan, 1917.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 61 (1941): 81–91.

- Passaro, Angelo. "Theological Hermeneutics and Historical Motifs in Pss 105–106." Pages 43–54 in *History and Identity: How Israel's Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History*. Edited by Núria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2006. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *The Reverse of the Curse: Paul, Wisdom, and the Law*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/114. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.
- Pietersma, Albert. "Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as a Case in Point)." Pages 33–45 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 53. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter." Pages 12–32 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 24. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- . "Ra 2110 (P. Bodmer XXIV) and the Text of the Greek Psalter." Pages 262–86 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John Wm. Wevers. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 20. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/190. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Popkes, Wiard. "Zum Aufbau und Charakter von Römer 1. 18–32." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 490–501.
- Porter, Calvin L. "Romans 1.18–32: Its Role in the Developing Argument." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 210–28.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Allusions and Echoes." Pages 29–40 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." Pages 98–110 in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Edited by Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006.
- . "Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel." Pages 97–124 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

- . “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology.” Pages 79–96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. *Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity* 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 2A. New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Räsänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. 2d ed. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 29. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- Reese, James M. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*. Analecta biblica 41. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.
- Reitzenstein, Richard. *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen: Ihre Grundgedanken und Wirkungen: Vortrag gehalten in dem Wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein für Elsass-Lothringen den 11. November 1909*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1910.
- Rhodes, James N. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Richards, E. Randolph. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.
- . *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/42. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.
- Richardson, Neil H. “Psalm 106: Yahweh’s Succoring Love Saves from the Death of a Broken Covenant.” Pages 191–203 in *Love & Death in the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope*. Edited by John H. Marks and Robert M. Good. Guilford: Four Quarters, 1987.
- Roberts, Richard. “St. Paul and the Book of Wisdom.” *International Journal of the Apocrypha* 18 (1909): 58–60.
- Roetman, Jan-Albert, and Caspar Visser ’t Hooft. “Le Psaume 106 et le Pentateuque.” *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 85 (2010): 233–43.
- Romaniuk, Casimir. “Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament.” *New Testament Studies* 14 (1968): 498–514.
- Rüsen-Weinhold, Ulrich. “Der Septuaginta-Psalter in seinen verschiedenen Textformen zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments.” Pages 61–87 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter*:

Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte. Edited by Erich Zenger. Herders Biblische Studien 32. Freiburg: Herder, 2001.

Sacks, Kenneth S. "Diodorus Siculus." Pages 472–73 in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3d ed. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. Oxford: Oxford University, 2003.

Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.

———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Pattern of Religions*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.

———. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983.

Sanders, James A. "Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon." *McCormick Quarterly* 21 (1968): 284–98.

———. "The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a) Reviewed." Pages 79–99 in *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*. Edited by Matthew Black and William A. Smalley. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

———. "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a)." *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 83–94.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1–13.

Satterthwaite, Philip E. "Judges: To the Reader." Pages 195–200 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.

Scarpat, Giuseppe. *Libro della Sapienza: Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento*. Biblica Testi e Studi 6. Brescia: Paideia, 1999.

Schaefer, Konrad. *Psalms*. Berit Olam. Collegeville: Liturgical, 2001.

Schenck, Kenneth L. *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Romans: The Righteousness of God*. Translated by Siegfried Schatzmann. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Römerbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

- Schmeller, Thomas. *Paulus und die "Diatriben": Eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1987.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 9. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975.
- . *Der Römerbrief: Ein Kommentar*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Schulz, Siegfried. "Die Anklage in Röm. 1,18—32." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 14 (1958): 161–73.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Zürich: Zwingli, 1970.
- Scott, James M. "Exile and the Self-Understanding of Diaspora Jews in the Greco-Roman Period." Pages 173–218 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Seifrid, Mark A. "Unrighteous by Faith: Apostolic Proclamation in Romans 1:18–3:20." Pages 105–45 in *The Paradoxes of Paul*. Vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Seiler, Stefan. "Theologische Konzepte in der Septuaginta: Das theologische Profil von 1 Chr 16,8ff. LXX im Vergleich mit Ps 104; 95; 105 LXX." Pages 197–225 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter: Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Herders Biblische Studien 32. Freiburg: Herder, 2001.
- Shipp, R. Mark. "'Remember His Covenant Forever': A Study of the Chronicler's Use of the Psalms." *Restoration Quarterly* 35 (1993): 29–39.
- Silva, Moisés. "The Greek Psalter in Paul's Letters: A Textual Study." Pages 277–88 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- . "Old Testament in Paul." Pages 630–42 in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "Borrowings from the Psalms in the Book of Wisdom." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 10 (1948): 384–97.

- . “A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (1973): 195–205.
- . “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism.” Pages 163–82 in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 46. Paris: Duculot, 1978.
- . *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 1. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smelik, K. A. D., and E. A. Hemelrijk. “‘Who Knows not What Monsters Demented Egypt Worships?’ Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity as Part of the Ancient Conception of Egypt.” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 17.4:1852–2000, 2337–57. Part 2, *Principat*, 17.4. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.
- Smith, Jannes. “A Linguistic and Exegetical Commentary on the Hallelouia Psalms of the Septuagint.” Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005.
- . “The Meaning and Function of Ἀλληλουῖα in the Old Greek Psalter.” Pages 141–51 in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leiden, 2004*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 54. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. “Renderings of Hebrew Comparative Expressions with מִן in the Greek Pentateuch.” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 12 (1979): 27–42.
- . *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo. Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae B/237. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987.
- Spilsbury, Paul. “*Contra Apionem* and *Antiquitates Judaicae*: Points of Contact.” Pages 348–68 in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Staab, Karl, ed. *Pauluskommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche: Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. 2d ed. Münster: Aschendorff, 1984.

- Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- . “A Decontextualized Paul? A Response to Francis Watson’s *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2006): 353–62.
- . “Paul and Scripture: Charting the Course.” Pages 3–12 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1992.
- . “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters.” Pages 125–55 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “‘Pearls Before Swine’: Did Paul’s Audiences Understand His Biblical Quotations?” *Novum Testamentum* 41 (1999): 124–44.
- Stern, Menahem, ed. *From Herodotus to Plutarch*. Vol. 1 of *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974.
- Stier, Rudolf. *Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie*. Andeutungen für gläubiges Schriftverständnis im Ganzen und Einzelnen: zweite Sammlung. Leipzig: C. H. F. Hartmann, 1828.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter to the Romans*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 57. Chico: Scholar’s Press, 1981.
- . *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- . “Text as Interpretation: Paul and Ancient Readings of Paul.” Pages 17–27 in *New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. New Perspectives on Ancient Judaism 3. Lanham: University Press of America, 1987.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Swancutt, Diana M. “Sexy Stoics and the Rereading of Romans 1.18–2.16.” Pages 42–73 in *A Feminist Companion to Paul*. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Marianne Blickenstaff. Cleveland: Pilgrim, 2004.

- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Fragments of a Psalms Scroll from Masada, MPs^b (Masada 1103–1742)." Pages 318–27 in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Michael Fishbane and Marc Zvi Brettler. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 154. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
- Talstra, Eep. "Deuteronomy 9 and 10: Synchronic and Diachronic Observations." Pages 187–210 in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis*. Johannes C. De Moor. *Oudtestamentische Studiën* d. 34. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought: An Essay to Which Was Awarded the Kaye Prize for 1899*. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thorsteinsson, Runar M. *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 40. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003.
- Throntveit, Mark A. "Songs in a New Key: The Psalmic Structure of the Chronicler's Hymn (1 Chr 16:8–36)." Pages 153–70 in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*. Edited by Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Tobin, Thomas H. "Controversy and Continuity in Romans 1:18–3:20." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 298–318.
- . *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1995): 581–600.
- . *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books." Pages 577–92 in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire*. Edited by Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker. *Orbis biblicus et orientalis* 38. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- . "The Septuagint." Pages 161–88 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*.

Edited by Martin Jan Mulder. *Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2/1. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988.

———. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

Tucker Jr., W. Dennis. "Revisiting the Plagues in Psalm CV." *Vetus Testamentum* 55 (2005): 401–11.

Ulrich, Eugene C. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Implications for an Edition of the Septuagint Psalter." Pages 323–36 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 24. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 3/230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

van Rooden, Peter T. "Die Antike Elementarlehre und der Aufbau von Sapientia Salomonis 11-19." Pages 81–96 in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C. H. Lebram*. Edited by J. W. van Henten, H. J. De Jonge, P. T. van Rooden, and J. W. Wesselijs. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Venema, G. J. *Reading Scripture in the Old Testament: Deuteronomy 9–10; 31 — 2 Kings 22–23 — Jeremiah 36 — Nehemiah 8. Oudtestamentische Studiën* 48. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Venetz, Hermann-Josef. *Die Quinta des Psalteriums: Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974.

Viard, André. *Saint Paul Épitre aux Romains*. Sources bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1975.

Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans*. Boston: Brill, 2003.

Wagner, J. Ross, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb, eds. *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Wallace, Howard N. "What Chronicles Has to Say About Psalms." Pages 267–91 in *The Chronicler as Author: Studies in Text and Texture*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham and Steven L. McKenzie. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Walter, Nikolaus. "Sapientia Salomonis und Paulus: Bericht über eine Hallenser Dissertation von Paul-Gerhard Keyser aus dem Jahre 1971." Pages 83–108 in *Die Weisheit Salomos im Horizont Biblischer Theologie: Mit Beiträgen von Hans Hübner, Lothar Ruppert und Nikolaus Walter*. Edited by Hans Hübner. *Biblisch-Theologische Studien* 22. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993.

- Wasserman, Emma. *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/256. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- . *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . “Paul the Reader: An Authorial Apologia.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2006): 363–73.
- . “Review of Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God*.” *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 179–85.
- . “The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1–15:13.” Pages 203–15 in *The Romans Debate*. Rev. ed. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Watts, James W. *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 139. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992.
- Weber, Emil. *Die Beziehungen von Röm. 1–3 zur Missionspraxis des Paulus*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 9.4. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1905.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. “Adam in Paul’s Letter to the Romans.” Pages 413–30 in *Studia Biblica 1978: III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1–11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Weiss, Johannes. “Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik.” Pages 165–247 in *Theologischen Studien. Herrn Wirkl. Oberkonsistorialrath Professor D. Bernhard Weiss zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht*. Edited by C. R. Gregory, Ad. Harnack, M. W. Jacobus, G. Koffmane, E. Kühl, A. Resch, O. Ritschl, Fr. Sieffert, A. Titius, J. Weiss, and Fr. Zimmer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897.
- Wevers, John William, ed. *Leviticus*. Septuaginta 2.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- . “The Earliest Witness to Jewish Exegesis.” Pages 115–27 in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, vol. 1. Edited by Bary Walfish. Haifa: Haifa University, 1993.

- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30. Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.
- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.
- White, John L. *Light From Ancient Letters*. Foundations and Facets: New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener-Verlag, 1978.
- Wilk, Florian. "The Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text." Pages 253–71 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 53. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Williams, Tyler F. "Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter." Pages 248–76 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Wilson, Gerald H. *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 76. Chico: Scholars, 1985.
- Wilson, Lindsay. "On Psalms 103–106 as a Closure to Book IV of the Psalter." Pages 755–66 in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 238. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Windisch, Hans. "Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie." Pages 220–34 in *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrichs zu seinem 70. Geburtstag (14. März 1914) dargebracht von Fachgenossen, Freunden und Schülern*. Edited by Gustav Adolf Deissmann and Hans Windisch. Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 6. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914.
- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 43. Garden City: Doubleday, 1979.
- Winterer, Angelika. "Ein Konflikt zwischen 'Starken' und 'Schwachen': Anlass für die Gestaltung und Gewichtung von Röm 1,18–32." Pages 139–49 in *Was die Bibel mir erzählt: Aktuelle exegetische und religionsdidaktische Streiflichter auf ausgewählte Bibeltexte. Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Franz Laub*. Edited by Herbert Stettberger. Bibel – Schule – Leben 6. Münster: LIT, 2005.

- Wittenberg, Martin. "Aspekte israelitischer Geschichtsbetrachtung in den Psalmen 105 bis 107." Pages 23–50 in *Kontinuität im Umbruch: theologische Aufsätze von Mitarbeitern an der Augustana-Hochschule in Neuendettelsau anlässlich des 25. Jahrestages ihres Bestehens am 10. Dezember 1972*. Edited by Wilhelm Andersen and Helmut Angermeyer. München: Claudius, 1972.
- Wright, N. T. "The Law in Romans 2." Pages 131–50 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 395–770 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 10. Ed. Leander E. Keck. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. 1st and 2d ed. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Leipzig: Deichert, 1910.
- . *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. 3d ed. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Leipzig: Deichert, 1925.
- Zeller, Dieter. *Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus: Studien zum Römerbrief*. 2d ed. Forschung zur Bibel 8. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. Unabridged 5th Rev. Translated by Mary Grosvenor. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.
- Zimmerli, Walther. "Zwillingspsalmen." Pages 105–13 in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. Beiträge zu Psalmen und Propheten. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler*. Edited by Josef Schreiner. Forschung zur Bibel 2. Würzburg: Echter, 1972.
- Zipor, Moshe A. "The Deuteronomic Account of the Golden Calf and Its Reverberation in Other Parts of the Book of Deuteronomy." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996): 20–33.

VITA

Alexander (Alec) J. Lucas was born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma and raised in Columbia, Missouri. He attended the University of Missouri–Columbia, where he earned a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and a Bachelor of Arts in Classics, both with Highest Distinction and departmental honors, in 1998. Following several years working in campus ministry, Alec attended Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri for two semesters and then transferred to Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. In 2005, he received a Master of Divinity degree from Trinity, once again with Highest Distinction.

While at Loyola, Alec was elected Vice President of Professional Development for the Theology Graduate Student Caucus, passed his comprehensive exams with Distinction and received the Arthur J. Schmitt Dissertation Fellowship. Alec was also active in the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL), both on a national and regional level. In addition to numerous presentations, Alec served as the Midwest Regional Representative of the Student Advisory Group, won three separate SBL graduate student paper competitions and was named the 2010 Regional Scholar for the Midwest region. From 2010–2011, Alec was a Fulbright Scholar at Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, where he worked with Professor Peter Lampe. Alec has published three articles in peer-reviewed journals, one essay in an edited volume, and numerous book reviews. Currently, Alec is a part-time faculty member of the Theology Department at Loyola University Chicago. He resides in Chicago with Keri, his wife of eleven years.